

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 1879.

The Week.

THE New York Republican Convention met at Saratoga on Wednesday week, and all went off exactly in accordance with the programme. Mr. Conkling was there looking his best, and all the henchmen reported for duty promptly. There was much discontented and insubordinate talk among the Reformers and Administration Republicans during the two or three days previous, but it quickly subsided as soon as Mr. Conkling arrived and fixed his eye on them. They also brought three or four "dark horses" with them, which they led about in the corridors of the hotels, and asserted they were ready to back to any amount; but when Conkling saw them they pretended they knew nothing about them—that they were the horses of a strange dealer which they happened to be looking at just as he came in. There does not appear to have been the slightest doubt of the success of Cornell, Mr. Conkling's candidate, from the beginning; in fact, all the arrangements were made beforehand. No introduction or eulogy of the candidate was necessary, and none was offered. Everybody knew Mr. Conkling's wishes, and that was enough. For the same reason Cornell was not cheered when nominated on the first ballot, any more than a horse is cheered which wins a race. The applause was given to the owner and trainer. There was nothing to be said of Cornell except that he was personally honest, had been dismissed from office by Mr. Hayes as an enemy of civil-service reform, and was a favorite adherent of Mr. Conkling's. The rest of the ticket is, with the exception of the State Engineer, more than usually good; but then the other offices to be filled are unimportant compared to the governorship.

The platform declares that the Republic is a nation and not a league, and is, as the Republicans say, "supreme within its own constitutional sphere," and castigates the Democrats; declares that to refuse supplies to compel the consent of a co-ordinate branch of the Government is "revolution," and accuses the Democrats in Congress of "revolutionary attempts" and of "nullifying schemes," and again castigates them; approves of "free and pure elections," and pronounces any attempt to repeal the national election laws "a conspiracy" to overthrow the safeguards of free suffrage; bestows "heartly approval" on President Hayes for his veto messages; repudiates military interference with elections, but maintains that when Republicans use soldiers at the polls it is "to protect the ballot-box from the interference of force and fraud," while the Democrats bring "armed clubs" to the polls to "intimidate the citizens," and "remain silent when the assassin's bullet seals the fate of political independence"; castigates the Democrats again for "partisan purposes," "revolutionary methods," "disturbing measures," and "dangerous designs" "under the sway of those who were lately in rebellion, and seek to regain in the halls of legislation what they lost on the field of battle"; approves of the resumption of specie payments, and disapproves of "debasing the standard, depreciating the paper, or deteriorating the coin"; protests against putting Confederate soldiers in offices taken from "old Union soldiers"; points with pride to the reforms in the State Prison and Canal management effected by the Republicans, and pronounces those who claim these reforms for the Democrats "public impostors"; declares that the system of taxation ought to be reformed, and would have been reformed before now, under a commission created by the Republicans, if their righteous designs had not here also been defeated by the Democratic Governor; approves of the supervision and regulation of railroads, which is apparently the only good thing the Convention proposed or had ever heard of that the Democrats had not diabolically tried to hinder or mar.

It will be observed that there is only one mention of President Hayes and the Administration, and this very cold and guarded, and that no measure of any kind in Federal legislation is supported, the greater part of the platform being taken up with denunciation of the Democrats in Congress, although there is this year no Federal election. Only one question of State concern—the supervision of the railroads—is alluded to except for the purpose of pointing abuse of the Democrats. In fact, the platform is a thoroughly Stalwart document, in that it proposes nothing except that the Democrats should not get the offices and should not be allowed to legislate, and affirms nothing except that the Democrats are bad fellows, and that the South is still animated by the spirit of rebellion. The two principal speeches—indeed, the only ones—those of Mr. Conkling and Vice President Wheeler, were in the same strain and covered the same ground, the latter especially being very violent. In so far as the Stalwart idea of the duty of a party in power can be gathered from them, it would seem to consist in the distribution of offices among "workers," the carrying of elections by "workers," and an annual meeting in each State to denounce the opposition and show that *all* its aims are highly criminal in character, and have the air of having been concocted in a penitentiary by the bad element among the convicts.

The most curious part of the performance is the perfunctory joy with which all parties profess to receive the result. All have gone home "to work heartily for the ticket," and Cornell is to direct the canvass with his accustomed skill. It is admitted that there may have been some grounds for dissatisfaction with the way the nomination was made, but then everybody must see the necessity of presenting a united front to the enemy this year—the implication being that there are certain years in which discontent may be allowed to show itself at the polls, but this is not one of them. Next year, it has been suggested, reformers can, if they please, oppose the Machine, but if they were to do it this year unknown consequences of a grave character would follow. The *New York Times* has an amusing story of "a gentleman of the utmost respectability" and of "marked ability," "wise, able, and eloquent," and "known to be true to the party," somewhere near Albany, who desired to "attend to his political duties," and to serve as a delegate at the Convention. He is promptly defeated at the primary, for "the sole reason that he would not" pledge himself to vote in the Convention for a certain man, and afterwards, if necessary, transfer his support according to the instructions he might receive from the political hack who controlled the party machinery in his district. The gentleman was simply an impudent theorist, and got his due. What had his "wisdom" or his "respectability" or his "eloquence" or his "faithfulness" to do with the matter, this year anyhow? Next year will be the great year for wisdom and ability at conventions.

Both California and Maine have gone Republican at the State elections held on the 3d and 8th instant respectively. In California, Perkins, the Republican candidate for Governor, naturally ran somewhat behind the rest of his ticket, owing to the union of the Democrats and New Constitution party upon Glenn. But his majority is large enough to indicate the utter demoralization of the Democrats and the virtual extermination of the "Honorable Bilks." The Workingmen gain the most substantial benefit from the election, perhaps, as they secure two of the three Railroad Commissioners, whose powers are great, and who can only be removed by a two-thirds vote of the Legislature. They also elect Kallach mayor of San Francisco, and in dividing the other city offices with the Republicans rather get the better of them. The latter elect all four of the Congressmen, however, and a majority in the Legislature which chooses a United States Senator, and thus place Califor-

nia "in the Republican column of Congress." As there were five State tickets in the field and eighty-seven offices to be filled in San Francisco alone, there is still some guesswork about the result, which will not be positively determined before the official canvass. In Maine, also, the returns are unusually slow in coming in. It appears at present that Davis has no majority, though a considerable plurality over Smith—Garcelon having made a wretched run—and will be elected by the Legislature, which is likely to be Republican in both branches; altogether a decided Republican gain over last year. The vote was the largest ever cast, and will probably reach 140,000. The constitutional amendment providing for biennial elections and legislative sessions was carried. Mr. Blaine estimates Davis's plurality over the Greenback candidate at 20,000, and over Garcelon at 40,000. The Greenbackers seem to have gained from the Democrats but lost as much and more to the Republicans. One thing is clear, that the currency issue and not the bloody shirt occupied the voters.

During this week and next in Massachusetts the half-dozen conventions which represent the discordant politics of that State will meet, and from their proceedings some idea may be formed of the probable result of the November election. Since the withdrawal of Governor Talbot the Republicans have been involved in a conflict of personal claims to the succession which has been marked by unusual persistency and acrimony, and has led some of the party press into precautionary denunciation of the crime of bolting. The hand of Butler is more or less discernible in the quarrel (for it is almost that) between the friends of Mr. Long and Mr. Henry L. Pierce. His quondam organ, the *Boston Traveller*, is now working hard for Long, and reports Butler himself as saying that he could beat Pierce rather more easily than any other candidate. The danger that the Republicans will take advice of Butler is, of course, not very great under any circumstances, and especially when, in the very act of making his boast, he opens on Mr. Pierce's character with a battery that ought to have been masked till after the nomination. He accuses Mr. Pierce of having engaged near the close of the war in a contraband trade with the rebels through the lines, and has brought to light proceedings had in 1873 by one of Mr. Pierce's associates against their agent in the business, which ended in a decision that the trade was illegal, and that no contract based upon it could be enforced. Mr. Pierce states that he has only just learned of the facts brought out in these proceedings, to which he had refused to be a party, that he never suspected that his money (which had been advanced at the request of a Republican friend) was being used improperly, and that his character as a Union man is too well remembered to be affected by such a charge. His word has never been impeached, and cannot be now, on the imperfect evidence adduced; but the Long men, and the Butler men, and the men who are Butler all the time and Long when it suits them, will use this reminiscence for their common purpose, at least up to the adjournment of the Republican Worcester Convention.

Mr. Garfield explained the other day to a *Herald* reporter, with the aid of a diagram, that the chief cause of uncertainty in forecasting the result of elections in Ohio was the movement of population. He estimated that while Ohio has received from the East about 750,000 of her population, she has parted with 770,000 to the West, and in like manner has acquired 25,000 from the South while retaining but 20,000. The voters that come from the East are apt to be laborers attracted by the mining and manufacturing demand, and are consequently Democratic "at first"; those from the South of course adhere to the same party. But Mr. Garfield seems to have underrated this Southern accession. A well-known correspondent of the Cincinnati *Commercial* reminds him that by the census of 1870 there were no less than 135,000 Southern-born residents of Ohio, part of an increasing movement northward which has been going on for at least seventy years. Comparing the statistics for other States, it appears that the Southern emigration to Indiana and Illinois was considerably larger than that to Ohio, and

that regarding the whole of both sections, "where one Northern man goes South to live, five Southern men move into the Northern States and stay there." What the approaching census may have to tell of this movement will be awaited with great interest, and not for political reasons only. Mr. Garfield opened another vista to curious speculation when he stated that the Western Reserve contributed more than a third of its strength to the Greenback party in Ohio. They were stalwart Republicans until carried away in 1872 by Greeley, since when they have been like sheep without a shepherd. Mr. Garfield now expects the Republicans among them "to be drawn back into our ranks by sheer party magnetism, assisted by their resentment of the revived Democratic extreme State-sovereignty doctrines."

The Cincinnati *Gazette* keeps up its fire upon the new Governor of Kentucky by asking daily whether or no he is the Blackburn who attempted to introduce yellow fever into the North during the civil war. It has now what it calls a "Blackburn department," wherein it prints communications, extracts from other papers, and investigations by its own reporters. One of these has made a polite call upon Governor Blackburn in order to offer him the opportunity of denying the ugly rumors which have found their way into the columns of the *Gazette*, but the Governor failed to take advantage of it, and has indeed preserved a uniform silence upon the subject. Another, no less a trained investigator than "H. V. B.," has unearthed the report to Secretary Seward of the United States Consul at Bermuda in 1864, which implicates some Dr. Blackburn or other in very infamous business. The *Gazette* protests that it is "surprised and pained" at certain unwarrantable intimations that it is "unfriendly to Governor Blackburn and the State of Kentucky," but still regrets its inability to get any light upon its constant conundrum from either of them. The *Courier-Journal* cannot be persuaded to contribute any information; but we believe a beginning has been made in inducing one Democratic journal in Kentucky to echo the *Gazette's* daily question. The *Chicago Tribune* is, however, a staunch ally, and the *Journal* shows its friendliness by printing the interrogation occasionally. On the other hand, since Secretary Sherman's plea for a closer union between Kentucky and Ohio, the Cincinnati *Commercial* seems disposed to silence its contemporary. "The trouble with the Cincinnati *Gazette* touching the Governor of Kentucky is on the increase," it says flippantly.

Mr. Field has returned to his attack upon his late "legislative ally" in a letter to the editor of the *World*, answering, as he says, "some very plain questions" addressed to him by the latter, who seems anxious that nothing to Mr. Tilden's disadvantage shall be unwisely hushed up. The letter is plaintive in its appeal to one's sympathies, but it is chiefly designed to show that the writer mistook the character of his ally, which appeared in Mr. Field's first interview. It seems clear that when Mr. Tilden whispered in Mr. Field's ear at the latter's residence, on the eve of his departure to Europe to visit his daughter, that elevated-railroad stock was "booming," he was expressing personal rather than convivial hilarity. And Mr. Field's failure to perceive this, and his consequent inference that Mr. Tilden would be guided by him in the disposal of his stock as to time, place, and price, will be regarded by none more than by Mr. Tilden's enemies as inexcusable weakness. The reporters have as yet not been able to draw any reply from Mr. Tilden, who is probably taking time to prepare a defence against the main accusation of the letter, namely, its implication that Mr. W. T. Pelton, in whose name Mr. Tilden's stock stood, is still honored with the intimate counsels of his uncle. We have heretofore pointed out that Mr. Tilden exploded the wicked-partner theory by reducing it to the absurdity involved in supposing so experienced and discerning a person as himself capable of being imposed upon by persons like Weed and Woolley and Pelton. But the fact that at the time of the cipher-despatches exposure this theory was his defence, will, we should say, make it particularly difficult for him to defend himself successfully now against the

charge of having restored to his confidence a partner whose wickedness he has publicly deplored.

Although no new shipments of gold were made during the week from London to New York, the arrivals here since we last wrote were no less than \$5,760,000. Including this sum and the amounts on the way, not far from \$20,000,000 gold has been gained from Europe, and this, too, before the cotton exports have been much felt in the foreign exchange market. It seems a reasonable calculation that fully as much more gold will be received during the remainder of the year. It is most fortunate for the money market that so much has come already, for otherwise it would have been in a distressing condition, as the borrowing demand has been greatly increased by reason of the rise in prices at the Stock Exchange, the creation of new collateral, and the enlarged volume of business, while New York bank facilities have been much reduced since 1873. During the week the ruling quotation for demand as well as time loans was 5 to 6 per cent., U. S. bonds and railroad bonds were firm, and the speculation in stocks was "strong to buoyant," notwithstanding the high prices current at the beginning of the week. The volume of mercantile business, judged by Clearing-house transactions, is nearly one-third larger than a year ago, and several branches of industry, like iron-making, are strained to the highest pitch of activity. The silver market has been dormant, the London price ruling at about 51½d. to 51¾d. per oz., and in New York the bullion value of the 412½-grain silver dollar ranging at 86½ to 86¾ cents, closing at \$0.8623.

We have discussed elsewhere the news from Afghanistan. The way in which Lord Lytton, the Governor-General of India, under instructions from home, forced a quarrel on Shir Ali, the late Amir, was by demanding that he should receive a resident ambassador at Kabul. He refused on the ground that the mere appearance of being controlled or overlooked by a British agent in his own capital would ruin him with his subjects, and that he could not answer for the safety of such an agent. No attention was paid to this, and his successor was compelled to receive one. This, combined with the fact that he had to go to the British camp to make peace, put Yakub Khan, in the eyes of the Afghans, in the position of Shah Soojah in 1839—that is, made him appear a foreign tool. His troops have accordingly mutinied, and, joined by the mob, have stormed the British residency and slaughtered the Minister, Sir Pierre Cavagnari, and his escort of British troops, seventy-seven persons in all. At this writing it seems likely that Yakub Khan, to ensure his own safety, has joined the insurgents, and the war will have to begin again.

The lesson of the tragedy of 1841 was that there is nothing the Afghans will not sooner submit to than anything like a sacrifice of their political independence; that the Amir is not a real despot, holding undisputed sway, and able to answer for his subjects, but simply a sort of suzerain ruling a number of turbulent tribes whose first allegiance is paid to their chiefs; that treaties with him, therefore, containing conditions which are likely to run counter to the popular sentiments are of no value, and that the only way of retaining influence in Afghanistan is to avoid all appearance of meddling, while privately keeping the Amir in good humor by presents and other favors. This lesson was acted on by the Indian Government from Pollock's retreat down to the accession of the Beaconsfield Ministry and the inauguration of "the Imperial policy." The inflated novelist who then took charge of the Empire determined to disregard it, and sent out a brother novelist and poet, nearly as inflated as himself, to discipline the Afghans and acquire a "scientific frontier," and we see the result. As to the future, of course Kabul will now be occupied; it was easily occupied in 1839 and 1842. The Afghans make no stand in the open field, but it can hardly be that the British public will allow the Premier to work out his plot any further. They must by this time have had enough of him.

The end of the charges against Captain Carey, of the 98th Regiment, who was with Prince Napoleon when killed, is very curious and hardly more creditable than the charges themselves. The court-martial, which appears to have lost its head as completely as the public at home, found him guilty of misconduct before the enemy, and sentenced him to be dismissed the service because he did not go back to rescue the Prince (though it said nothing about his not rescuing the two troopers who were also killed), and there was an answering groan of indignation all over England. It is now admitted, however, that Carey was not on duty at all; that the Prince, though he held no English commission, was in command of the party; that it is the duty of a reconnoitring party not to fight, but to fly; and that Carey did nothing wrong. So the proceedings of the court-martial have been quashed, and he has been ordered to return to his regiment after he has paid a long visit to his family. In fact, he was received on his return as a popular hero, and it only remains for Dean Stanley to offer to inter him in Westminster Abbey to make the affair a complete illustration of what appears to be the growing mercurialness of the English temperament. Apropos of the Prince, there is in a recently published letter of Prosper Mérimée, who was an old friend of the Empress, an account of an interview with her at the Tuileries in September, 1870, just before her downfall, but when the end was certain, in which he says: "Elle n'avait plus la moindre illusion, et disait que ce qu'elle désirait pardessus tout pour son fils, c'était une vie heureuse et sans ambition." Unhappily she got over this resignation when she reached England, educated him as an intriguing pretender and a thorn in the side of his country, and spent her money supporting Bonapartist newspapers in France.

There have been rumors, more or less definite, ever since Prince Bismarck obtained the support of the Ultramontanes in Parliament, and Dr. Falk resigned, that he was negotiating a peace with the Pope; but it looks somewhat as if he had started them himself, and as if peace was really no nearer than ever. The *Vienna Correspondance Politique*, a semi-official sheet, has a letter from Rome which professes to tell the story of the negotiations which Monsignore Roncetti was sent as nuncio to carry on. The writer says that Bismarck is firm in refusing to surrender the state control of religious corporations, or the obligatory university education for priests, or the obligatory communication by the bishops to the Government of all their appointments, or the State Ecclesiastical Court at Berlin, which has jurisdiction of clerical offences against the law, or the obligatory return by the bishops of all fines above a certain amount inflicted on priests. As these are the principal matters in dispute, it cannot be said that much progress has been made towards a settlement. In fact, it would appear that all Bismarck offers is to fill the places of the dead bishops and let the exiled ones come back to their sees.

There is a singular but instructive contest pending in Belgium between the Catholic clergy and the state. The Liberals, having now a majority in the Parliament, have determined to take the public schools out of the hands of the priests, who, since 1842, have had complete control of them. Under the law recently passed religious instruction is to be given in the schools at a certain hour, by priests, to those children whose parents shall call for it, but beyond this the clergy is to have nothing to say to the management. The bishops, however, have not only forbidden the curés to give such instruction, but have directed them to refuse the sacraments to any teacher who attempts to supply their place by teaching the children the catechism. It is reported that in some dioceses the bishops have gone still farther, and have directed that absolution shall be denied to all masters of primary schools serving under the new law, and to both the teachers and pupils of the normal schools. This report is not thoroughly authenticated, but the Ultramontane papers have not as yet denied it. The affair is useful, as showing what the Catholic clergy will do when circumstances are favorable, and how thoroughly conditional their liberalism is apt to be.

THE NEW YORK MACHINE TRIUMPH.

IN spite of the threatenings of the mutinous Republicans, there never has been much doubt that the late Convention at Saratoga would nominate Mr. A. B. Cornell, if Mr. Conkling insisted on it. The only question was whether he would insist on it, and the chances were all in favor of his doing so. There was nothing in his career to justify the belief that he would be prevented by a regard for the success of the party. He has never shown any hesitation in leaving the party to its fate at any election which was not likely to affect him personally. This year his personal position made it extremely desirable that he should produce some striking proof of his power, both by way of avenging himself on the Administration which had deprived him of the New York Custom-house, and by way of showing that the recent scandal has not damaged him politically. For this purpose he could not have hit on a better thing than the nomination of Cornell for the governorship of New York. The greater Cornell's unfitness for the place, judged by the ordinary standards, the more valuable is the nomination as a proof of his patron's ascendancy. There was, therefore, every reason for expecting Mr. Conkling to insist on it, and he did insist on it, and carried his point after the usual amount of babble among his opponents about other candidates. There was nothing in the history or condition of the opposition to him to make him waver for one moment. The Machine which he controls has now been in operation for several years, and is probably the most perfect instrument of its kind in existence. He constructed it with great care during the Administration of General Grant, who put into his hands the whole patronage of the Government for that purpose, besides fortifying him with every other mark of confidence. The accession of President Hayes and the withdrawal of the Custom-house have not broken it up, or even slightly deranged it, for reasons which we set forth last winter when commenting on Mr. Conkling's triumphant re-election to the Senate, but which will bear repeating.

Mr. Hayes was elected as an ardent civil-service reformer, and was to aim at a "thorough, radical, and complete reform." It was this more than anything else which brought down on him from the very first the hostility of the old party managers. They pretended that it was his desertion of the freedmen, but it was in reality his violation of the rules of the game in his mode of filling the offices from the Cabinet down. His Cabinet was made up in complete breach of the established usages, and his great offence at the South was his giving so many good offices to persons who not only had not worked for the party, but had really never belonged to it. Now, if he had carried out the reform policy thoroughly and consistently, and made no departures from it, two results would have followed. In the first place, the zeal of the Independents, whose influence was acknowledged both on the platform and in his letter of acceptance, would have been still further kindled. They would have felt that they had at last got a champion of their ideas; that by standing by him they could open a considerable future for these ideas, and if not build up a party on them, at all events secure for them a firm and permanent foothold in the Republican party, and make opposition to them in the party discreditable and impolitic. In the second place, his policy would have made such an impression on the public mind that the Democrats would not only have found it unassailable, but would have been compelled at all events to feign acceptance of it, as the rule of their conduct also, whenever they got into power; so that, altogether, it would have assumed in all eyes the air of something permanent, of a return to the early and better practice of the Government—at a time, be it remembered, when legislation was no more favorable to the purity of the civil service than it is now—the air, in short, of a solid and fixed improvement in the machinery of administration from which any succeeding President would hardly have ventured to depart.

But President Hayes did not do this. He has unquestionably made improvements in the civil service, which we do not mean to belittle; but side by side with these improvements he fell into some of the very worst practices of the old régime. He used the

offices lavishly to reward party and personal services. The dispute about his title ought to have made him exceedingly careful about using Government patronage to reward persons to whom he was indebted for his accession to the Presidency, and this is true whether such persons acted ministerially or judicially. But he showed no more hesitation than Conkling or Blaine would have shown, in providing for nearly every one of them, good, bad, or indifferent, by means of offices, the disposition of which, as he acknowledged, was committed to him as a solemn trust. This was a great mistake. It had various grave consequences, but the gravest of all were the diffusion among the real friends of civil-service reform of the belief that, having been again deceived, they were pursuing a chimera, and the diffusion among the politicians of the belief that such changes as Mr. Hayes had made in the direction of reform had taken no hold of the popular mind, and were not permanent, and would be disregarded by the next Administration, whether Republican or Democratic.

It is to this last that the continuance of Mr. Conkling's strength is due. No one can deny his skill as a Machinist, and the party believes that as soon as Mr. Hayes goes out the Machine will work again with the old gearing; that the Custom-house belt will be again put on the wheel, and all go on as before; and that if his successor is a Republican, Mr. Conkling will again wield his old power in the State. Men who care, therefore, for political activity, and fancy they have a political future, refuse to quarrel with him. He is to them still the coming man, and when they find him bent on any scheme, they sooner or later support him in pursuing it. This is the whole secret of the two recent degrading exhibitions in the politics of the State—his unanimous re-election to the Senate by the party majority in the Legislature, and the total collapse of the opposition to his putting his chief henchman in the chair which Seward and Marcy and Dix have filled. The Republican papers all acknowledge that without his support Cornell would probably not have received one hundred votes, so that we are driven to the conclusion that one man has nominated the Republican candidate, and that the meeting of the convention and the balloting were in reality mere forms which might have been dispensed with, and that the work might have been done by a letter to the newspapers from Mr. Conkling. The final touch was given to the scene by the failure of the Convention to applaud the successful candidate when his nomination was announced. The cheers were reserved, and appropriately enough, for his master.

Whether Mr. Cornell can be elected will, of course, depend a good deal on what the Democrats do. But the argument by which condonation, connivance, or approval have been claimed for all other errors and shortcomings of the Republican managers during the last ten years—"the bloody shirt" and the wickedness of the Democrats—is as strong for his election as for anything else, and the speeches of Mr. Conkling and Mr. Wheeler showed that their reliance on it is as great as ever. If it is successful this time, it will undoubtedly send Mr. Conkling to the Presidential Convention next year with greater prestige than before, but it will also commit the Republican party to a decided return to all that is worst in its history and composition. It will strengthen all the evil influences in the Convention to know that "the pivotal State" of New York is in such hands and can be carried by such means.

The readiness with which the Independents, or Reformers, or "Administration Republicans," or whatever one pleases to call them, have fallen in with the Stalwart view of the proper work of the party, is of itself, even if he had not had abundant experience of their timidity and vacillation, sufficient justification of the small account in which Mr. Conkling holds them. It was plain from the first month of Mr. Hayes's Administration that if they conceded that denunciation of the South (for legislation about the South, be it remembered, is admitted to be at an end) was the chief and proper business of Republican politicians, their rôle was ended. In this business the Stalwarts cannot be excelled, and it furnishes them with an abundant excuse for the neglect of everything else. A Reformer waving "the bloody shirt" is, in the nature of the case, a

ridiculous spectacle, and nobody enjoys it more than Conkling, and yet, with strange fatuity, for the last three years Reformers have been deliberately trying to show that they could wave it as well as anybody. The appearance of Messrs. Garfield and Foster as Stalwarts has been a somewhat discreditable performance, but not half as bad as Mr. Sherman's attempt to outrun the whole field by declaring that the question whether the Federal Government should supervise elections was more important than the condition of "money, property, and labor." That question has, of course, a certain importance. Now and then, as at this moment in South Carolina and Mississippi, it may be desirable that the Federal Government should be able to supervise elections when certain districts are in a disturbed condition, but it could only have supreme importance in case the majority of the States, at least, became too turbulent or corrupt to conduct elections at all; and in that case where should we get the pure and good men for the Federal Government who would see that right was done? Where does the Federal Government get its morality, as well as its physical force, but from the States? There is no school for Federal statesmen except the school of State politics; and whenever State politics become generally so depraved that the State authorities cannot be trusted to conduct elections fairly, we may rely upon it the Federal Government will not trouble itself with the task. It will find shorter ways of evolving law and order. The great interests of this country, as of all countries, are, and must ever be, "money, labor, and property." On these its morality, its strength, and its future depend. A party which ostentatiously neglects them, or pushes them into the background, for the purpose of indulging in declamatory vituperation of communities which it does not control, must of necessity be led by tricksters and machinists.

THE REVOLT IN KABUL.

IT is difficult to overestimate the gravity of the news which has been received from Afghanistan, of the rising of the troops and populace at Kabul against Yakub Khan, and the massacre of the entire British Embassy, including its chief, Sir Pierre Cavagnari, so conspicuous in the late operations. The effect of this tragedy on both Indian and British politics is likely to be serious in the highest degree. As regards Indian politics, it means that the occupation of Afghanistan with a considerable force will now be deemed necessary, and that the expense of this will fall with crushing weight on the already greatly embarrassed Indian treasury.

It is a difficulty, too, from which there is no escape without the loss of that prestige in the eyes of the natives which is one of the conditions on which the Indian Government exists. In fact, one of the strongest objections to the policy of annexation or extension of the frontier line is that the Government cannot anywhere afford to be beaten or to be compelled to retreat, for fear of being lowered in the estimation of the bulk of its subjects, and therefore ought not to expose itself to slights or indignities where it can possibly avoid it. It will not only have to go to Kabul, but stay there; for one of the unfortunate positions taken in the controversy with the late Amir Shir Ali was that there must be a British Resident in Kabul to watch the Russians, and, in fact, superintend the Amir's foreign relations. What has happened now shows that this Resident must have an army for a body-guard, and that no ruler set up by the English, or supposed to be in the pay or under the influence of foreigners, is likely to be much stronger or better able to assert his authority than the unfortunate Shah Soojah, who was put on the throne by a British army in 1839 and killed when the British were driven out two years later.

Our correspondent, himself an Indian officer, writing in the *Nation* of last week on the present condition of India, made a singularly shrewd estimate of the situation in Afghanistan when he said:

"Afghanistan, rent asunder by internal dissensions, is fast tumbling to pieces; and Yakub Kahn and Major Cavagnari are at this moment in precisely the same position in Kabul as were Shah Soojah and Sir William Macnaghten in 1840. It will be little less than miraculous if the former Englishman succeed in escaping the violent death which fell upon the latter."

It will be little less than miraculous if the former Englishman succeed in escaping the violent death which fell upon the latter."

An army for a body-guard at Kabul, however, means the occupation of the whole country, the garrisoning of the principal towns, and the policing of the great lines of communication—in other words, the occupation and government of the country; and there is no difference of opinion as to its being the most difficult country to govern of its size in the world. The Indian revenues already are unequal to the demands of peace; there has been a heavy deficit during the past year, necessitating a loan from the Home Government; the depreciation of silver, in which the taxes are received, shows no sign of coming to an end, and the loss on exchange in paying the interest on the debt held in England is therefore heavy. What is worst of all, however, is the fact that the limit of endurable taxation has been reached; there appears to be no difference of opinion on this point among competent observers.

How the Ministry will face the crisis, however, it is hard to see. It is not possible to postpone a dissolution of Parliament beyond next year, so that there will not be time in the interval for the Afghan difficulty to be got out of the way. The achievement of the "scientific frontier," of which Lord Beaconsfield boasted recently at the Lord Mayor's dinner, was due to a series of apparently lucky accidents and blunders—that is to say, it could not have been obtained if Shir Ali, instead of offering a vigorous resistance, had not fallen sick and died. Nor could it have been obtained if the Russians had not substantially got all they wanted under the Treaty of Berlin, and therefore abandoned their intrigues in Afghanistan. The independence of Bulgaria, the virtual independence of Rumelia, and the virtual surrender by the Turks of their right to occupy the Balkans, together with the retention of the claim for a war indemnity, came so near the original provisions of the Treaty of San Stefano that there was no longer any motive for stirring up the Afghans, and Shir Ali was left to get out of his scrape as best he could. But it turns out that his objection to receiving a Resident—that it would discredit him with his own subjects—was not a mere pretext. It was based on a better appreciation of the situation than his son, Yakub Khan, seems to have possessed. The "scientific frontier" has, therefore, vanished. The frontier of Herat and of Balkh, which the British were bound to defend if attacked, by the treaty with Yakub Khan, and which therefore became the real frontier of British India, is not a scientific frontier, but a remote and very difficult and costly one, and up to it the British must apparently now go, not to repel an attack from Persia or Russia, but in order to keep order in Afghanistan itself. In other words, the object of the late war has not been achieved, and the boasting of the Premier at the Lord Mayor's dinner turns out to be empty.

The gain for the Liberals is obvious enough. They have all along maintained that the wisest thing to be done with Afghanistan was to let it alone; that there was no meddling with it at all without meddling a good deal; that the agreement made with Russia in 1868, to treat it as outside the sphere of international complications, was the best possible arrangement, and that the best frontier India could have was the one she had before the late war. The late tragedy, which repeats the lesson of 1841, must powerfully support this view in the eyes of the voters, enforced as it is by the badness of the times. Nearly all the most eminent Anglo-Indians concurred in it, and especially the late Lord Lawrence, one of the highest authorities, if not the highest authority, during his life; but nothing availed against the Premier's self-confidence and the desire of his colleagues to carry out, as Lord Salisbury says, the policy which has been the real policy of England since the days of Elizabeth. This sort of talk was very potent two years ago, and if the murder of Sir Pierre Cavagnari had occurred then there is little doubt it would have roused the Jingo enthusiasm of the period to boiling point. But there has been within the year a complete loss of interest in foreign affairs. The course of events in Turkey, in Cyprus, and in Africa has brought nothing but disenchantment. Some things which then stirred men's blood now excite a smile when mentioned, such as the

protectorate of Asiatic Turkey and the acquisition of Cyprus. In Afghanistan alone was there any appearance of success in carrying out the ministerial programme; but the Afghan policy too must now be set down in the list of ministerial failures. The revolt in Kabul, instead of rousing enthusiasm, will probably only deepen reflection, and bring home more surely than ever to the bulk of Englishmen a sense of the tremendous responsibility entailed by the possession of India.

It will probably also help to bring the public to something like a final decision of the precise shape which the foreign policy of England is hereafter to take. This question has never been settled since the rise of trade and commerce, and the growth of the public conscience after the peace of 1815, made the rôle of a mere bully distasteful to an increasing portion of the community. The path traced out by Cobden, or the Manchester school—that of a peaceful trader—was never really acceptable to the great body of the people. It involved much too wide and sudden a break with the great traditions of English history, and seemed to many who had no sympathy whatever with a hectoring or aggressive demeanor to involve the waste and loss of an influence which, whatever objections there might be to the mode in which it was acquired, might be made to work immense good for less fortunate divisions of the human family. So that when Lord Beaconsfield first began to swagger, before his real aims were known, he touched the imagination of great numbers to whom the England which he has since conjured up, fighting right and left for “British interests,” and prepared to sacrifice 30,000 Bulgarians sooner than suffer a diplomatic check in the harem at Constantinople, was inexpressibly odious. It was these, doubtless, whom Sir Charles Dilke had in his mind the other day, when he said that it would not do for the Liberals to extinguish Jingo enthusiasm; that the task before them was to direct it rightly—that is, so to use it as to make English influence the result of a bet or thing than naked displays of power; that is, of sincere sympathy with all “who are desolate and oppressed,” or nobly ambitious. If the foreign policy of the country passes into the hands of this class, they will certainly begin the work of reform as any prudent philanthropist would in private life, by establishing a stern proportion between means and ends. They will see that the world has grown too big and populous and rich for England any longer to play the part in it she once played. Other people have got ships and men and money, too, and the cruelty and injustice of promising what cannot be performed, and meddling where one cannot mend, has been wonderfully illustrated by every one of Lord Beaconsfield's late enterprises abroad.

THE PEOPLING OF HAWAII.

THE Hawaiian aborigines are decreasing; the total population of their islands is increasing. The movement of the population in the Hawaiian group, as shown by the census of December last, will not, indeed, attract attention on account of its magnitude. The lately-published account of that enumeration would not fill more than three of the 2,326 pages which are required for the ninth census of the United States; the ratio of these numbers nearly represents that of the island to the American population. Yet the transformation of the Hawaiian has something of the interest of a chemical experiment in which the combinations go on without disturbance and swiftly; and the smallness of their scale renders them, to use a convenient Baconianism, a more maniable subject. The total island population is now scarcely 58,000; but for the first time since the European occupation of the group it is increasing—in what way and with what promise we will show briefly.

The repopulation of Hawaii might be called a problem of three bodies. Three races are mainly concerned in it—the aboriginal Polynesian, the Chinese, and the Anglo-Saxon. The first, as a pure race, are still losing ground for reasons which we have lately pointed out (*Nation*, July 24, 1879). It is, however, an error to expect their extinction in the course of a few years, even should their present rate of decrease continue. Calculating a diminution of ten per cent. for each of seventeen sexennial periods following the census of 1878, there would still remain in 1980 an aboriginal population of 7,847. Its numbers, though always lessening,

would, theoretically at least, disappear no sooner than a conchoid curve would meet its asymptote.

The Chinese are rapidly gaining ground, by immigration chiefly as yet. The whites are increasing with moderate rapidity both by immigration and by the multiplication of their descendants of unmixed blood. A fourth class, however, seems destined in the natural order of development to become the dominant one in the Islands, though it is not as yet very strong numerically—it is the half-breeds. The table annexed will indicate the movement of each of these classes:

Population of the Hawaiian Islands.	Dec. 27, 1872.	Dec. 27, 1878.	Differences.
Total population.....	56,897	57,805	1,088
Number of Aborigines.....	49,044	44,088	-4,956
Half-breeds.....	2,487	3,120	633
Chinese.....	1,938	5,916	3,978
Americans.....	889	1,276	387
Britons.....	619	883	264
Portuguese.....	395	436	41
Germans.....	224	272	48
French.....	88	81	-7
other foreigners.....	364	666	302
Total number of foreigners.....	5,366	10,477	5,111
Number of Hawaiian born, of foreign parents....	849	947	98
native males.....	26,139	23,988	-2,151
native females.....	22,914	20,700	-2,214
all children under six years of age....	6,869	7,608	739

The ratios of decrease of the total population by periods have been as follows: 1850 to 1853, three years, 13.10 per cent.; 1853 to 1860, seven years, 4.70 per cent.; 1860 to 1866, six years, 9.67 per cent.; 1866 to 1872, six years, 9.62 per cent.

From this it appears: 1. That the decrease of the aborigines, amounting to more than ten per cent. during the six years from 1872 to 1878, has been more than compensated by an increase in all of the other leading elements of the population, the gain in the total amounting to 1.91 per cent. 2. More than half of the numerical gain is credited to the Chinese; but this, as the census figures do not inform us, is due in main part to the immigration of Chinese laborers, who have been brought over from San Francisco in large numbers to work upon the sugar plantations since the reciprocity treaty of 1876 with the United States went into effect. For thirty years past, however, Chinese merchants and sugar-planters have formed a much-respected class of island residents. Never having been outlawed, like the Chinese in California, they have thriven in business and have settled permanently on the islands, often marrying the native women. As lately as March, 1876, a Government paper stated that “even the lower orders of Chinese are, we believe, reckoned by the Hawaiian women to make more faithful and attentive husbands than the similar class of Hawaiians.” They sometimes even educate their children in the Christian religion. But the island Chinese—if a digression may be permitted—keep up a heathen respect for their ancestors. The present writer has often seen them finding their way in the spring to the graves upon the slopes of the hills near Honolulu, and depositing upon them their pious offerings of food, sweetmeats, and colored candles. It must be added, however, that practices more reprehensible and less pagan than these have been observed among the later Chinese immigrants; notably that the laborer, after marrying and accumulating his savings, would sometimes desert his Hawaiian wife and children and return to China, perhaps to a wife and family of an earlier date, to enjoy his little independence. This practice became, indeed, so frequent that it had to be repressed by law, with the result of encouraging the growth of the half-breed population.

3. The whites, American and European, supply the dominant element in the business and the religion of the islands, and take also a considerable part in their politics. They are distributed in the census under several items. The American and the British-born residents number 1,276 and 883 respectively; the “Hawaiian-born of foreign parents” (mostly American parents), 947. With other white foreigners the sum total of European birth or descent will not be less than about 4,000; and their sexennial increase has been about 25 per cent. In the numerical repair of the population the whites thus rank next after the Chinese. But the immigrant population is comparatively unstable in either case. That is to say, the American, European, or Asian-born resident may at any time return to his own country, and frequently does so; while the half-breed quits the island scarcely oftener than the aborigine himself. One might say that complete foreign parentage prevails against nativity, but that nativity and one aboriginal parent prevail as against one foreign parent. It need scarcely be added that in the islands, as gene-

rally where a more civilized is crossed with a less civilized race, the aboriginal parent is always the mother. As for the aboriginal Hawaiian, he never quits the islands permanently; and his leaving them temporarily, even as a foremast hand on a whaling ship, is permitted only under legal restrictions.

The immigrants, therefore, are likely to be in themselves a somewhat less important element in the rebuilding of the Hawaiian people than might be supposed from the census figures. The American merchant, physician, planter, returns with his savings to the United States; the American missionary too returns; but commonly without any savings, and to no asylum. A considerable part of the children also settle in the fatherlands, in the spirit of country lads who seek careers in the city. But with the second generation of unmixed descent a considerable increase of the white population may be expected. The resident children and grandchildren of American Protestant missionaries already number several hundreds, and early and fruitful marriages are scarcely less common among them than they were among their New England ancestors in the seventeenth century.

4. The half-breeds, though fewer in numbers as yet than either the whites or the Chinese, form under the present conditions the strongest element in the growth of the population. Theirs is no mere residence: it is an indigenous and permanent growth; more than this, it is an adapted growth. The half-breed does what the aborigine cannot do: he adjusts himself to the changed conditions of life around him; he is healthy and fertile. His Hawaiian mother generally dies young; his white or Chinese father perhaps deserts him; but he retains a firm foothold upon the soil. The children of white fathers by native women are of an energetic but somewhat volatile character; those of Chinese fathers have often a less active temperament, but are susceptible of a good degree of education and even of refinement. Both prefer the Hawaiian to the paternal languages. "Some of the largest families which have been borne to Hawaiian women have been by Chinese fathers," says the report just mentioned. The extreme fertility of the Polynesian-European cross has needed no further proof since the peopling of Pitcairn's Island, where indeed extreme fertility accompanied the closest in-and-in breeding. The "plantation," again in Bacon's phrase, of 1789 consisted of nine English sailors and nineteen Tahitians, six men, twelve women, and one infant—twenty-eight souls in all—of whom all the men but one were dead, either of disease or at each other's hands, by the year 1800. The accession of four "outsiders" only to the colony is recorded (1823 to 1832); but in 1856 the colony numbered 194 persons. It should be remembered, however, that no attempt to change the Polynesian conditions of living, at least as regards the women, was made during the first generation in this little community. They led the Polynesian life of license. The Europeans killed first the native men, and then each other; and it was not until all the males but two were gone that the survivors, Smith and Young, turned their hearts to religion and "diligently sought for the Bible and Prayer-book," for which they had not had any occasion before. The swarming children of that earlier and turbulent time were brought up under strictly Christian principles; and as the little island grew crowded they had to discourage early marriages. The Hawaiian half-breeds take equally kindly to civilization.

We have compared the movement of the Hawaiian population to the processes of a chemical experiment that has been thus far undisturbed. What disturbance of the movement, social and physiological, may come at any day from abrupt interference, as by foreign annexation or seizure, or by the importation of foreign labor, now greatly in demand, cannot of course be foreseen. But in the absence of such incident forces it seems that the repair of the island population is likely to come mainly from the half-breeds. Under present conditions Hawaii, like Chiloe, Brazil, and parts of Fiji, would replace its people with a mixed race, in which the white, the Chinese, and the Polynesian blood would be mingled. The blood of the pure Polynesians is thus fading as much as perishing. Judge Fornander, an American of thirty-four years' residence in Hawaii, dedicates his recent book on 'The Polynesian Race' (London, 1878) to his daughter Kaonohiulaokalani "as a reminder of her [Polynesian] mother's ancestors." The aboriginal Polynesian will be sought for in vain; but the strain, as in this case, will not be absolutely lost; it will have blended with stronger currents.

THE OPPOSITION LEADERS IN ENGLAND.

LONDON, August 23.

THE close of the session leaves the Government weakened, but it can scarcely be said to leave the Opposition strengthened. What the for-

mer have lost the latter have not gained. It is not in politics as in the physical world. There forces are simply transferred or transformed. Here they seem, at least, to be spent. As Conservatism always profits by the public indifference and apathy, the balance of advantage arising out of this state of things will too probably remain with Lord Beaconsfield and his colleagues. The fault, to speak the truth without reserve, lies mainly with the leaders of the Opposition, and may be distributed in about equal proportions between Mr. Gladstone and Lord Hartington. Mr. Gladstone's incessant and passionate activity wearies and estranges those whom it is his business to win. His denunciations and arguments are like too powerful shocks from too strong a battery, which exhaust instead of stimulating. Lord Hartington, on the other hand, fails to stir any active force at all. This apathy and Mr. Gladstone's overpowering excitement contribute equally to the same undesirable result:

"Professus grandia target;
Serpit humi tutus nitium timidisque procellae."

Both fail to captivate.

It would be too much to say of Mr. Gladstone, as Victor Hugo said of the first Napoleon, that he *gêne Dieu*. Mr. Gladstone's eminent virtues and his affectation of the part of a sort of terrestrial and human Providence to England may be endured. There is some reason, however, in the complaints which are made, not only by adversaries but by friends, of Mr. Gladstone's recent tone and language. He does not, indeed, after the fashion of Alexander, in Dryden's lines, "assume the God, affect to nod, and seem to shake the spheres." He is too humble and Christian for that. His fulminations are rather papal in their tone than pagan. Occasionally his denunciation of his adversaries seems to require that sort of cheek which the lines suggest:

"Let not this weak, unknowing hand
Presume thy bolts to throw,
And deal damnation round the land
On each I judge thy foe."

Mr. Gladstone is always careful to say that he never imputes motives, but he lets it appear, or rather in spite of all his efforts he cannot help it appearing, that he thinks his adversaries very bad men. Mr. Gladstone is essentially a theologian among politicians, and the theological temper is apparent in his denunciations. Like *Sir Fretful Plagiary*, when he is most excited he protests that he is perfectly calm. His angriest denunciations are accompanied with the assurance that they are the deliberate and well-weighed expression of his most mature convictions. His extreme exaggerations are followed or preceded by the statement that he is prepared to make them good in detail, word by word, and syllable by syllable. This is a phenomenon of temper rather generally human than peculiar to Mr. Gladstone, but it is a misfortune to see it exhibited in so extreme a shape and with such uninterrupted repetition by a man of his high character and historic fame. He still lives in a region of clouds and tempest. The ampler ether, the serener air, into which advancing years should raise a man he has not yet attained. The calm equity, the habitually gentle and indulgent judgment, are lacking which suit his experience and which would give additional gravity to an occasional severity of judgment. As it is, Mr. Gladstone's censure too habitually seems to spring rather from an excited temper than from a calm and fair estimate of men and things. There can be no doubt that men are getting tired of these displays. If Mr. Gladstone does not *gêner Dieu*, he bores the British public. His occasional writings and speeches—I do not, of course, use the word occasional in the sense of infrequent—seem to spring from a temperament which must express itself, from impulses which must find a vent, rather than from any urgent necessity making their utterance a duty. They are not confined, as all the world knows, to politics. Literature and art and theology, social conduct and domestic economy, suggest to Mr. Gladstone improvisations, both on the platform and in the periodical press, which are perfectly wonderful as examples of versatility and readiness, but which cannot be said to possess any permanent or intrinsic value. With immensely quick faculties of observation and thought, with interests to which scarcely anything human is foreign, with a memory at once ample and minute, Mr. Gladstone has acquired in the intervals of a busy public life an immense variety of opinions upon almost every topic which interests mankind. But the engagements of his public life have not allowed him the leisure to reduce those opinions to principles, to connect them with each other in an orderly and logical fashion, or to give them that form which raises their expression to the rank of literature. His various writings and addresses, so far as they lie outside the range of political debate, give little more than the haphazard notions, about things in general, picked up during a long life by a man actively

engaged in business of a special sort. This phenomenon is a very common one. The ideas about all kinds of topics which shrewd and intelligent men engaged in active life express at dinner-tables and in their private correspondence are often very interesting and suggestive; but they would not bear publication. Unfortunately, Mr. Gladstone does publish these incidentally and accidentally acquired opinions and half-formed impressions, hastily clothed in language which an unexampled copiousness of words suggests to him with a facility too great for happy choice or careful artistic effect. Mr. Gladstone's essays and addresses, outside the limits of contemporary politics, are for the most part the table-talk of a very able, variously, and of necessity superficially, informed and incessantly active mind upon all sorts of topics. If they had been collected by some assiduous admirer of the Boswell order from his casual conversation they would have possessed very great interest and permanent biographic value. Reduced by himself to writing, and published as contributions to controversy, they do not rise to the level of the professional magazine. Mr. Gladstone's reputation as a scholar and as a man of varied thought and cultivation would unquestionably have been higher if he had never written a line for publication.

In English politics, in spite of representative institutions and the ultimate power of general public opinion, individual character is an immense force. Personal government in one sense of the word will always exist. Unfortunately for the Liberal party, its leaders are less interesting persons than their opponents. Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Salisbury, in spite of many faults which a cool criticism detects, impress the imagination of their countrymen more powerfully, or, at any rate, take their superficial fancy more pleasingly, than any of their rivals. The strange curiosity which Lord Beaconsfield excites, the sympathy due to the courage with which he has fought his way and held his own, his self-command and self-restraint, and his whimsical cleverness, have a charm of their own. Lord Salisbury's heroic vein is often mere swagger and bluster, and his sarcasms have the coarseness of stage repartees; but he is, at any rate, trenchant and decisive. When an effect is made, few people will stop to analyze the worthlessness of the elements of which it consists. If Mr. Gladstone had understood how much more the half sometimes is than the whole, if he had practised some economy of his intellectual resources and personal appearances, if he had known the degree in which reserve and reticence not only stimulate interest but are essential to that personal dignity which no statesman in England, or anywhere else, can safely lay aside, he might have held his own against any antagonist in public opinion; but he has wasted and is wasting these elements of popular influence and legitimate moral ascendancy. Lord Granville is rather a politician of society than of the great world. He rather greases the wheels of the political machine than contributes to the forces which propel them on. He is a man, probably, of finer taste and more delicate discernment than the late Lord Palmerston, whose good-humored jocosity he imitates. But there was a force behind Lord Palmerston's occasionally somewhat coarse bluster and his very bald jokes which the public does not recognize behind Lord Granville's more urbane raillery, and his more suave and fluent eloquence. Lord Granville seldom makes a speech which does not contain several good jokes and more than one apposite and telling anecdote. But the humor is usually a little in excess of the substance of the speech; the sack is out of proportion to the bread. If it may be said without offence, Lord Granville a little overdoes the comic business. He is in danger of sinking the part of the hero of the Liberal stage in that of the first funny old man. If he could communicate to Mr. Gladstone a little of his playful and airy detachment in minor matters, or Mr. Gladstone could contribute to him something of his earnestness on grave things and his grasp of great questions, two at least of the elements essential in a successful political leader would be combined.

Lord Hartington's straightforwardness and a certain homely good sense, negative and slow indeed, but valuable as a check upon rash courses and heedless enterprises, are very good qualities in the leader of an established and secure majority; but they are not those which win victories against great odds, and convert minorities in the country and in Parliament into majorities. Lord Hartington wholly wants initiative, and he follows where he might at least seem to lead simply by his being a day or two, or occasionally only a few hours, too late in making up his mind. His conduct on the flogging question was an instance. In that matter, as in some others, he yielded, after a vain and public struggle, to the youngest but most active of the three members for Birmingham, and gave occasion to the Tory joke—it was Mr. Beresford Hope's, I believe—of his being the Vice-Chamberlain of the Liberal party. Mr.

Bright and Mr. Lowe are rather surviving names than surviving powers. Mr. Bright retains much of his old eloquence; but he has not that general political knowledge and that acquaintance with administrative detail which are necessary to leadership. A certain roughness, partly due to temperament, partly acquired in the work of political agitation, partly, perhaps, attributable to the Quaker habit of bearing truthful testimony to the faults and to the faces of friends and foes, would make him impossible as a leader, even if advancing years, and energies declining more rapidly than his years advance, did not otherwise put such a choice out of the question. Mr. Bright has elevated a natural gift of personal rudeness to the level of a fine art, and the consequence is a personal dislike towards him which to a great extent undoes the influence that his great oratoric powers and his unselfish and consistent career have deserved. Mr. Lowe has been never more than a guerilla warrior, and seems of late to have lost his firm grasp even of the few and narrow principles which he used to apply at once with logical and rhetorical effect. If he has not retired from public life, public life seems to be retiring from him. With these men in the front rank of the Liberal party its leadership appears to be in suspense. The hour, perhaps, may bring the man. Whether it is to be Mr. Forster or Sir William Harcourt, Sir Charles Dilke or Mr. Chamberlain, or some yet undiscovered hero, is a secret of the future.

† † †

JULES SIMON AND THE FERRY LAWS.

PARIS, August 22, 1879.

ONCE met one of my friends, a very humorous journalist, who informed me that he had just arrived from Vienna, where he had been studying the politics of Austria. "How did you manage, as you don't know German?" "Oh!" said he, "I followed the military bands." In Paris the best method for a foreigner not acquainted with our language would be a daily visit to the kiosks, where the newspaper vendors exhibit the caricatures. A superficial inspection would prove to him that the man of the day, the best-abused man of the season, is M. Jules Simon. "Comment en un plomb vil l'or pur s'est-il changé?" Two years ago, on the 16th of May, on that famous day which marked a period in our political history, Jules Simon was dismissed almost contemptuously by Marshal MacMahon, and his forced retirement was followed by a dissolution. Who deserved better than M. Jules Simon the support of the Republican party? The success of this party in the general elections was almost a personal success for him: his policy was vindicated, the country stood by him. Still, when the retirement of Marshal MacMahon took place, as a logical consequence of the general elections, and after a period of uncertainty during which the power of the Marshal was little more than nominal, the name of Jules Simon remained in the background. It seemed as if he alone could not recover from the blow of the 16th of May. Another man had become the acknowledged leader of the Republican party, another man had canvassed the country and roused the popular passion—the very man who had once been the adversary of Jules Simon at Bordeaux. When peace became necessary after the capitulation of Paris, the Provisional Government sent Jules Simon to Bordeaux, and ordered that general elections should take place in France, even in the provinces occupied by the Germans. When Jules Simon brought the decree of the Government to Bordeaux, Gambetta, who had during the siege of Paris assumed the position of a dictator, thought for a moment that he could continue the war, and tried to hinder the elections. He meditated for several days a *coup d'état* at Bordeaux; with his friend Ranc, with Spuller, and a few others he made all the preparations for resisting the decree signed by Jules Favre, by Simon, by the other members of the Government. It is well known that the interference of Prince Bismarck put a stop to these designs; Jules Simon and Thiers, who stood by him at the time, triumphed over the resistance of Gambetta. The elections took place; Thiers was made chief of the Executive power, and peace was signed. Gambetta, whom Thiers publicly called at that time a *fou furieux*, retired in disgust to San Sebastian in Spain, and remained there during the French Commune.

Ever since that time there has been a deep feeling of enmity between Gambetta and Jules Simon, and this enmity has now become quite apparent. Gambetta has given in France the signal for the *Kulturkampf*; he said in his last manifesto at Romans, "le cléricalisme, c'est l'ennemi." M. Jules Ferry may be considered as his lieutenant; Spuller and the physiologist Paul Bert (who writes the scientific articles in the *République Française*, which was long edited by Gambetta) are Gambetta's intimate friends. Jules Simon has taken his stand against Article vii. of the Ferry laws, and he advocates the principle of free teaching. I do not be-

lieve that he has chosen this position merely as a strategical one. He may have been deeply wounded by the ingratitude of his party; he had been the principal victim of the 16th of May, and he had been completely forgotten by the *trionphateurs*. It seemed as if his political friends could not forgive him the anxieties of a long electoral struggle. Still, the motives of M. Jules Simon must be of a higher order. He is himself a very distinguished professor of the University; he has been a disciple of Cousin, he has long professed philosophy in our higher schools; but in all his books—and he has written many—he has always given himself out as a perfect Liberal. Liberty for all has been his motto during a lifetime—liberty of teaching as well as liberty of thinking. He believes in the excellence of truth, and does not believe in the efficacy of persecution. He has a perfect right to say now that it would be a *shame*—he constantly uses this word—if, after having supported the principles of liberty when they were weak, the Republicans abandoned it now that they are strong and believe that the country is on their side. His opposition to Article vii. of the Ferry laws (the article which forbids all the members of unauthorized congregations to open schools) has been fatal to the law in the Senate. The Chambers were adjourned for three months before any public discussion could take place in the Upper Chamber, and in the Senatorial committee which was appointed on this subject the majority pronounced itself adverse to the article. This vote, which was given almost on the eve of the separation of the Chambers, does not involve the vote of the Senate. The result is therefore still quite unknown, and during the recess there is naturally a constant agitation in the country. The anti-clerical papers keep up an incessant fire on the unfortunate Jules Simon; he is represented in the caricatures in the costume of a Jesuit, and, as I have said, he is just now the best-abused man in France.

What will be the result of this agitation? I confess that I would not venture to prophesy it. The anti-clerical agitation is entirely artificial; it was not rendered necessary by any encroachment of the Church, or by any open attack on the Republican Government. One of the leaders of the Republican party, to whom I remarked that since the Republicans had had the majority after the 16th of May, they could not accuse the Church of having made France anti-republican, confessed that his friends had not much to complain of in respect of the Church; but he thought that something was needed in order to keep together the various factions of the Republican party. He argued that the 363 deputies who had stood together against MacMahon were divided in their political tendencies; they were all, or almost all, afraid of the Commune; they had to find some common ground on which they could stand together, and Gambetta, who is the leader of the majority, could only find the clerical question. France was completely surprised by his declaration of war against Catholicism. Though he called it clericalism, it is clear that Catholicism and clericalism are the same thing in a country where the immense majority of the population is Catholic. The French clergy has really given no serious offence to any Government for a long time; it has followed the rule, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's." Some of its members may have a sentimental attachment for the House of Bourbon—a French priest can hardly forget that Saint Louis was a king of France—but did the clergy make any serious opposition to the Republic of 1848? Did they refuse their homage to Napoleon III.? During the invasion of France our priests behaved with much patriotism, and when the Commune broke out in Paris the Communists chose many of their victims from the ranks of the clergy.

It has been found so difficult for the supporters of the Ferry laws to bring serious accusations against the clerical teaching, that they have had to fall back on books of casuistry published in the seventeenth century; they read chapters of the 'Provinciales' of Pascal; but these old folios of casuistry are as much forgotten now as the books of the University of Paris which were in use in the lifetime of Abélard. Jules Simon, who is much more versed in French literature than M. Ferry, has chosen his opportunity with great art. He cannot be accused of harboring dark designs against the Republic—he is a Republican of long standing; he cannot be accused of being a clerical—he has always been known as a philosopher; he belongs to no church; his religious feelings are of the rarefied and idealized sort, which are neither Catholic nor Protestant, nor even Christian. He is as much in harmony with Plato as with Saint Paul. He is not so much of a Christian as Renan. All his philosophical works show him to be a mere Theist; and it may even be said that his Theism is not very remote from Pantheism. Such is the man who says to the Republicans: "Do not turn the Jesuits by force out of their schools." They can give him the hat of Basile in the caricatures; everybody knows that he is not Basile.

It is undeniable that the opposition of Jules Simon to the Government has produced a great effect on the country. I am inclined to believe that the majority of the people is on the side of toleration, and would prefer the policy of Simon to the policy of Gambetta and of the Government. But it must not be forgotten that no people is so politically timid as the French people; no people is naturally so little inclined to opposition when the Government seems a little determined. The ministers have all spoken strongly in the Councils-General, which are just now convened, in favor of the laws on education; they have tied their fate to the fate of their colleague, and with him they will stand or fall. The Councils-General have even been invited by the Home Minister to pass resolutions on the subject of these laws. Last year the majority of these Councils were still Conservative, and many resolutions were passed in favor of the liberty of teaching. "I am sorry that I cannot yet give you a precise account of the declarations of our Councils-General. They are now just beginning their sessions, and a few days must elapse before the great question of the day is finally discussed by them. It would seem at first that the Councils-General must speak this year as they did last; but the political pusillanimity of the provinces is such that one year's tenure of office of the present Cabinet must already have worked great changes, not in the feelings, perhaps, but in the expression of the feelings of the respectable Councillors who represent the departments. The Government must not be offended, even if the Government is wrong; such is the state of mind of the great majority of those who call themselves conservative in the provinces. This spirit of submission made it possible for Napoleon III. to rule so long without meeting any opposition, and to engage France in many wars; and the misfortunes of 1870 have not changed this instinctive feeling of the Conservative party. This party will always cling to anything that has the appearance of an established power. It will be hard for M. Jules Simon, who is out of office, to triumph over his friends in office. Perhaps a compromise will be found at the end of the parliamentary recess, but what this compromise could be I confess I cannot well imagine.

Correspondence.

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your suggestion that "a less formal system of organization of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, such as that of the German Association of Naturalists, would be found beneficial," may be followed up with further suggestions on the same line—e. g.: 1. That the Association should print only the addresses of its President and Vice-Presidents, or such other addresses, lectures, or reports as the Association itself provides or calls for, along with a brief abstract of proceedings. 2. That the money thus saved be devoted to furthering hopeful researches, or facilitating the publication elsewhere of the best papers brought before it which may need such aid. It is, of course, understood that the greatest benefit of the meetings comes from personal conference of the members, both in the general sessions and especially in the sections, and in their presentation and discussion of the scientific work done during the preceding year.

A. G.

THE ONEIDA COMMUNITY'S CHANGE OF BASE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your editorial in last week's *Nation* on Oneida Communism shows the penetration and sagacity which a reader of your paper from the beginning naturally expects; but you have been slightly misled by the Froudes and Macaulays of the daily press. It is unfortunate, if they must chronicle an internal cause for the late action of the Community, that they are obliged to fabricate one by piecing together old notes and conjectures, for they must try again. I explicitly deny that, "self-appointed" or otherwise, I have led any movement in the Community which has extorted this concession from my father, with whom I have been in substantial agreement for some time. We have had trouble from time to time for several years on account of my tendency towards what he calls "Positivism," but I have never allowed these differences to force me into any party antagonism. Your conjecture of collusion between the opponents of complex marriage in the Community and the clergy is unfounded.

Yours respectfully,

THEO. R. NOYES.

ONEIDA COMMUNITY, Sept. 8, 1879.

MR. HULBERT'S APPOINTMENT BY THE BUREAU OF
EDUCATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION :

SIR: My eye has just fallen upon a paragraph in your paper of August 28 which does great injustice to the parties involved. You are aware that statements often get into the papers which are painfully inaccurate, when not wholly false, and which, in their celerity of movement, defy all attempts at their arrest. Such is the item to which you have referred as going the rounds of the papers concerning my son in his service for the Bureau of Education at Washington, and upon which you have animadverted with such caustic severity. I have not made haste to correct the misstatement for the reason, suggested in your criticism, that it carries on the very face of it proof of its own falsity. I am surprised that a paper of the character of your own should put a moment's confidence in such an absurdity, and then advance, without enquiring into the truth of the rumor, to your ungenerous personal assaults. It is not true that my son has received what may properly be denominated an *appointment* by General Eaton; much less is it true that he has been sent forth "as a traveling commissioner to go to Europe and examine the systems of education in Great Britain and the Continent." But it is true that, having an half-formed purpose to visit England, and possibly the Continent, and to defray his expenses by his own exertions, that purpose was made complete by the Commissioner's engagement of his services in behalf of the Bureau while travelling in the *rural sections* of England, and for the period of *two months*; and for this service he does not receive a compensation which will more than cover one-half of his expenses. General Eaton has not provided "a chance" for my son to travel in Europe at the expense of the Government. As to whether the Commissioner is "guilty of an outrageous piece of favoritism" in engaging my son to render a responsible service, limited as to place and time, for a simple pittance in compensation, and whether there has been such an unworthy "connivance" as that which you charge upon the Commissioner and myself, and whether I have acted a part unbecoming my official position, I will leave for the public to judge.

Respectfully yours,

C. B. HULBERT.

MIDDLEBURY COLLEGE, VT., Sept. 2, 1879.

[Yes; but why should a young man who has just left college, who knows nothing of England, and cannot have much, if any, experience of systems of education, be employed on a public service which, if worth doing at all, ought to be done by a thoroughly competent person and in the best possible manner, even for two months and even in "the rural sections of England," and even for half his expenses? Why should official weight and character be given to his reports on education in any part of the world? The story, as circulated, is undoubtedly a great exaggeration, and does injustice to Mr. Hulbert; but if we cannot rely on college graduates to refuse even countenance to abuses, great or small, of the public patronage, on whom can we rely?—ED. NATION.]

CIVILIAN APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION :

SIR: In your issue of the 7th of August, remarking upon the list of civil appointments to vacant second-lieutenancies in the regular Army, you say: "It is well known that the first or 'orderly' sergeants of the companies of the line perform virtually all the official work of their companies beyond certain signatures and parade posturings." The *Nation* is usually so correct in its statements that it is painful to see it falling into the error so common to uninformed civilians, that Army officers are ornamental appendages with no labors or duties connected with their positions. The remark must have been hasty and ill-considered, for heretofore the *Nation* has not been slow to acknowledge the services of the poorly-paid and hard-worked officers of the Army.

The duties of a first sergeant are responsible and important, but they are strictly those of an enlisted soldier, are subordinate in their nature, and are confined to such details of administration as can best be performed by a soldier who lives with, and is in constant association with, other soldiers. His duties require but a very limited amount of education, but require habits of self-control, of honesty, firmness, and impartiality, which entitle those who worthily occupy the position to much respect and confidence. They are duties which could not be performed by a commissioned officer, but yet it is necessary that they should be con-

stantly supervised by one; and if it were possible for a company commander so to neglect his duties as to leave the virtual performance of all of the official work to his first sergeant, the fact would at once become evident in the non-effectiveness of his company. Under our present system of inspections and responsibility it is not possible for an officer thus to neglect his duties and retain his position. If a moment's consideration is given to the multifarious nature of the wants and needs of a company, be it infantry, cavalry, or artillery—its equipment, its discipline, its instruction, and its command—it should be evident that the company commander must have official work, and plenty of it, "beyond signatures and parade posturings," which cannot be delegated to the first sergeant.

I believe the fact that so few non-commissioned officers are appointed to second-lieutenancies is due rather to a want of material than to any disposition on the part of line officers to ignore the claims of deserving men. If the class of men spoken of by the *Nation* existed, it would seem that the company commanders, with whom the recommendations originate, would prefer, for their own comfort, the appointment of well-instructed soldiers to that of green civilian youths, who can be of but little use until they have served for some time. But the fact is that the number of non-commissioned officers fit for promotion, deplorable though the fact may be, is extremely small. In the vast number of cases where there is sufficient education and ability, the soldier is unfitted by habits of dissipation. In my own regiment there have been two recent cases where it has been found necessary to cancel the recommendations for this cause.

The cause of the want of character in the enlisted men may, I think, be found in our vicious system of recruiting; in which the officers are located in the slums of large cities, and, of necessity, pick up a large percentage of the vicious and depraved, who degrade the service and discourage the respectable class from entering.

The real evil in the appointment of these civilians is the method of their selection and the very slight educational requirements.

A LINE OFFICER FROM THE RANKS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION :

SIR: In your issue of August 7 you say, with reference to appointments in the Army, that "when commanding officers of military subdivisions and members of boards find that they cannot secure the appointment of their own friends and relations in civil life through the rejection of soldiers, there will be plenty of the latter who will pass the required examination," etc. Will you kindly specify what commanders of military subdivisions or what members of boards you refer to, for if you have no facts to sustain your innuendo you are unjust, while if you have any it will be of advantage to the service, and indirectly to the country, to name the offenders. You are probably ignorant of the nature of the examinations passed by such non-commissioned officers as have been rejected, but your ignorance on the subject gives you no excuse for making unfair reflections.—Yours with due respect,

A MEMBER OF A BOARD.

[To this we reply that it is not possible to enter into the consciences of the five hundred members of boards and commanding officers recently connected with the examination and recommendation of candidates for promotion from the ranks of the Army, or to expose the motives of any of them in any particular case. Neither the endorsements of the commanders nor the actual examinations of the boards are made public; but if they were, the former may be, and often necessarily are, expressed in terms of personal opinion not within the range of criticism; and the latter, unless conducted altogether by written questions and answers, or phonographically reported, would prove nothing. There is, however, no injustice in drawing from the only facts that are officially published deductions applicable not to persons but to whole classes of public servants and to a general system, though we freely admit that the wording of the observation to which our correspondent objects was unfortunate and liable to misconstruction. We remarked, wholly without reference to individuals, upon the grand result of a perfunctory compliance with a statute of the United States preferring soldiers, next after the graduates of West Point, before civilians, which ended in the appointment of four enlisted men (exclusive of two or three from the Signal Service, whose cases are under special law and in another category), and a preliminary list of twenty-three civilians, a number of whom are officially designated by the

War Department as relations of Army officers, as if that were the avowed motive for their selection. It is not essential to a comment regretting this result that any of the successful civilians should be proved to be the actual blood relatives or personal friends of any particular officers charged with the duty of examination and recommendation. Commissioned officers pride themselves upon constituting one military family, with close ties offensive and defensive, and, besides those on the favored list, there were several hundred unsuccessful civilian applicants, in some of whom some officers among the hundreds concerned probably took a natural interest. It must be noted also that the list of twenty-three forms only the advance of the civilian invasion, as the soldier element is supposed to be exhausted for an indefinite time to come.

The matter is one too comprehensive and serious to be disposed of by, or to be allowed to degenerate into, a personal controversy, as it affects the relations of the whole body of officers to the whole class of soldiers. It is either true that there exists among commissioned officers of our Army a strong prejudice against promotion from the ranks, with the hope of, and apparently recognized claim for, favor to "the military family" in the filling of vacancies—the whole tendency being to influence, perhaps unwittingly, the discharge of a duty imposed by law; or, on the other hand, the personnel of the rank and file of the Army of the United States is abominably bad and hopeless. There is something wrong about one of the two classes, if not about both. Twenty-five thousand men are now in service, any of whom can be appointed by his immediate commander to the grade of non-commissioned officer and be eligible under the law for examination as second lieutenant. If during many months only four out of these thousands have been found to be fit by general education and moral character for that promotion, having already the military skill not possessed by civilians, there is surely something radically vicious in our present system. The fact is the more surprising when it is officially asserted, and is obviously true, that the recruits to the Army during the last five years have shown a high standard both in education and morals. It is quite possible that few applications were actually made and pressed by enlisted men for the examination in question, but that explanation would be a fatal admission, suggesting the cause to be that the soldiers are generally impressed with a feeling that it would be of no avail for them to combat the prejudice before referred to. It is probable that if, by an amendment to the present law, suggested in our remarks, the selections for vacancies should be strictly limited to actual soldiers, after exhausting the Military Academy, those soldiers would be offered an honorable incentive which would redeem them from their present miserable condition. If their past failure is wholly due to defective education, that could readily be supplied by the military schools of all well-ordered posts, and if it is their moral character that constitutes the objection, ambition is more likely to improve it than despair. So that while it is neither practicable nor profitable to charge criminal malfeasance in the matter under discussion upon any particular officer or in any special case, all the facts publicly known corroborate the statement made by us, that when officers find that no vacancies can be filled from that class outside of the ranks which is now actually favored by the appointing power, and in which they take a natural interest, there will in fact be found plenty of soldiers who will pass the required examination, even if the latter shall be rendered able so to do merely through the working of a more judicious system, and through release from a possibly unjust suspicion of prejudice.—ED. NATION.]

THE INDEPENDENTS IN THE COMING CANVASS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the *Nation* of August 21 you echo the enquiry, which had already been made by *Harper's Weekly* and the *Boston Herald*, as to what has become of the Independents of 1876. As one of that body, and a not inactive participant in the Fifth Avenue Hotel conference, I have waited with some curiosity for any response your enquiry might call forth. None seems to have come—at least you have made none public;

and yet the enquiry was certainly a most pertinent one. Under ordinary circumstances the Independents ought to make their presence felt in the discussion which precedes the Presidential canvass. Then the party lines are forming, and their formation can be influenced. After they are formed the Independent can do little more than join himself to the one side or the other.

The question, however, naturally suggests itself, Are the existing circumstances ordinary? I think they are not. They are wholly different from what they were in 1876. In May of that year I attended the Fifth Avenue conference, and in November I voted for Mr. Tilden. Little confidence as I then had, and less as I now have, in Mr. Tilden personally, I regret that he was not inaugurated, as he certainly was elected. Under his skilful and cunning manipulation, the Democratic party, rendered timid by the possession of power, would have become highly discreet and conservative; while the Republicans, transformed into an energetic and aggressive Opposition, would both have prevented any serious public harm and educated the country to better things. The greatest boon this country can now hope for is just that—a weak Administration and a powerful Opposition.

The total incapacity for political leadership and the absolute genius for blundering which the Democratic party has displayed during the last three years are qualities certainly not calculated to allure recruits. As a force in opposition it now is, as for eighteen years it has been, a complete and utter failure. In itself this is a small matter, but unfortunately in all free countries it is to the Opposition that you must look for the aggressive enunciation of principles. Political parties should come into power not to hold the offices but to carry out a public policy which has been matured while the long struggle for power was going on. It was so with the Republican party in 1861. This the modern Democratic party has never been able to appreciate. Accordingly it has had no principles whatever, and has none now. A reed shaken by the wind, it has relied for a return to power on the popular discontent with the long-continued rule of the Republican faction. The one idea of its leaders has been to catch votes, and to do this they have not hesitated shamelessly to consort with every political strumpet who has flaunted through the land. Greenbackism is the last.

These are not ordinary circumstances. The strength of the Independent rests in the fact that party leaders believe that, under certain conditions, he will assuredly join their opponents. This is the ground he stands on. By their course during the last three years the Democratic leaders have done their very best to cut this ground out from under our feet. On the other hand, during these years Mr. Hayes's Administration has been thoroughly clean and respectable. Under such exceptional circumstances as these how can the Independent be otherwise than silent and quiescent? If, for instance, the understood candidate of the Administration, Secretary Sherman, should next year be nominated for the succession on the financial and business issues, I take it there is very little doubt that the Independents will quietly fall into line and vote for him. On the other hand, should any of the "Stalwarts" receive the nomination, there can be as little doubt that such of the Independents as do not stay at home will vote to put the Republican party in opposition.

Is not this view of the situation sound? and if it is sound, why should the Independents bestir themselves? They are there, and every party leader knows they are there. The only difficulty is that, until instructed by the elections in Maine and Ohio, the Republican leaders are not sure that the Bourbons of the war issues are not a more numerous element for conciliation; while the Democratic leaders incline to think that the Greenbackers count more votes. With each it is a pure question of vote-catching. They will make up their minds presently in the light of the election returns. Meanwhile, in the even balance of parties, things seem to be going on very comfortably. The Republicans seem likely to be beaten in New York, and the Democrats in Ohio. Both results are desirable, as the first will smash the Republican machine, and the last the Democratic-Greenback alliance. Then we shall see clearly. If the Republicans make respectable nominations and put themselves on the business issues, well and good. If they fail to do so, the alternative is not a very dreadful one. With a powerful and aggressive Opposition, led by incomparably the best parliamentary ability in the country, even Democratic stupidity in power could not in four years do any considerable public harm. In every way it would be far less politically dangerous than four years more of what the Grant régime was. Times of bad administration are times of active political discussion; and, looking to the best results ten years hence, it may well be doubted whether any intelligent Independent would now feel called upon to lift a finger to put

one of the two political parties in power, or keep the other out, as the end of all the President-making which the coming year is to witness.

I sincerely hope, however, that in response to your enquiry I shall not be the only one of those who met at the Fifth Avenue who is now heard from.

A.

Boston, September 7, 1879.

Notes.

A. WILLIAMS & CO., Boston, have just issued a facsimile, at scale, of Hales's large map of that city in 1814. The details are carried so far as to indicate by the mode of etching the public or private character of the buildings, and their construction of wood or otherwise. In point of outline and general topography this map marks the division between old and new Boston, and possesses a high degree of interest for all students of the city's history. —Some maps in the seventh annual report of the Boston Board of Health, which reaches us at the same time, show forcibly the consequences of the growth of population in the last half-century. The dependence of the health of the city on a connection of its sewage system with that of its suburbs in the watershed of the Charles and the Mystic was undreamt of in 1814, but here proves to be a fact calling for immediate recognition. The Board makes some practical recommendations about inspection of all drainage plumbing, and traces in a striking manner the relations between diphtheria and unsanitary premises. —Mr. Ervin T. Case's 'Battle of the Mine,' in the Rhode Island series of personal narratives of the rebellion (Providence: S. S. Rider), to which we have often alluded, is one of the most graphic yet published. Slighter, yet not wholly valueless, is Mr. Edwin Metcalf's reminiscences of service with the 3d Rhode Island. "Rhetorical finish is of no consequence," doubtless, in these familiar papers, but perhaps the proof-reader should be allowed greater license than to pass such expressions as (p. 28) "I don't know as I asked myself . . . but I recollect very well of thinking." —The late General Hood is said to have left a manuscript history of the war, which he had intended to publish this autumn. It is to be hoped the report is true. —The seventh Congress of Women is to be held in the Capitol at Madison, Wisconsin, on Oct. 8-10. The topics for discussion embrace the fields of science, education, and social science, and the number of speakers set down under each increases in the order just given. Five doctresses are among them, besides nine married and three single ladies. Mrs. Dr. Mary Putnam Jacobi will discourse on the Physical Basis of Mind; Mrs. Anne Mitchell Macy on Children's Books; Miss Abby W. May on the Work of Women on School Boards; Miss Charlotte E. Finch on Girton College; Miss Lavinia Goodell on Women in the Law; Mrs. Julia Ward Howe on Women in Western Europe, and there are numerous other pertinent subjects announced to be treated by less well-known names. —The following English announcements we take from the *Athenæum*: 'England: its People, Polity, and Pursuits,' by T. H. S. Escott; 'Morocco,' from the Italian of Edmondo de Amicis; 'American Painters,' by G. W. Sheldon; 'With the Armies of the Balkans and at Gallipoli in 1877-78,' by Lieut.-Col. Fife-Cookson; 'Natural History of the Ancients,' by the Rev. W. Houghton; and a 'Biographical Dictionary of Scotchmen,' by Joseph Irving, which may deserve a place beside Mr. Alfred Webb's 'Compendium of Irish Biography.' —In the same issue (Aug. 23) Dr. Schweinfurth furnishes the *Athenæum* with an interesting account of the travels of Dr. Wilhelm Junker on the upper Nile. This well-qualified explorer was able to correct Schweinfurth's own itinerary, and his discoveries along the divide between the Nile, the Albert Nyanza, and the head-waters of the Welle are of the first importance. At this writing he should be on his way to the Monbuttu country again. —The report prematurely made in the latter part of May of Prof. Nordenskiöld's safe arrival in Eastern waters has now come true. The *Vega* was released on the 18th of July, and passed East Cape into Behring Straits on the 20th. After some dredging in those northern waters, Yokohama was reached on Tuesday, September 2. It is a singular commentary on the supposed perils of Arctic navigation that this unprecedented voyage was achieved without loss of life or property, while the ship *Nordenskiöld*, sent eastward to the *Vega's* relief, was lost off Yesso a fortnight after the former had entered the Atlantic. —Of Prof. Daniel Sanders's 'Ergänzungswörterbuch' ('Dictionary of the German Language' supplementary to all existing dictionaries, including that of Grimm), which has been already mentioned in the *Nation*, the first two parts, comprising the letter A and a small portion of B, have appeared.

—Part 6 of Oncken's 'Allgemeine Geschichte' (B. Westermann & Co.) continues the history of Greece to the battle of Mantinea and enters upon the Macedonian period. The illustrations of statuary and architecture are as numerous and as well executed as usual, and include the great Attic poets, historians, and orators of the time. Maps of Attica and Laconia are added.

—Recent bulletins of the Treasury Department contain decisions of Secretary Sherman upon certain art matters that are interesting. The customs officers at this port having charged a duty upon engravings printed in this country from an American plate, but sent abroad for the signature of the artist who painted the original picture, appeal was taken to the Secretary. The decision was sustained on the ground that the engravings return in a different condition and with an increased value. This has led to the suggestion that foreign autographs, especially those of crowned heads, for collecting which some persons have a mania, ought not to be allowed the benefit of the free list, as they are at present, unless the receiver is prepared to make affidavit that they are not imported for sale. In Philadelphia Miss Sarah Hecker has been obliged to pay a higher duty on some pottery she imported because it had been decorated abroad, and so came under the head of decorated china-ware. In her appeal to the Secretary she set forth that this decoration had been done by an American artist, and that, therefore, her pots and jars should have been admitted as undecorated pottery, the duty on which is low. Her appeal, it is needless to say, was not sustained, and American artists residing abroad may heed the hint thus given them and take care to paint only on American material if they do not wish to be suddenly summoned some day to pay the same duty as that charged on foreign pictures. The law, again, now allows the free importation of "cabinets of coins, medals, and all other collections of antiquities, specially imported and not for sale." The last clause was added in 1874, and has, no one needs to be told, a prohibitory effect in many instances. Museums and galleries are proverbially poor, and it is impossible for them to watch European opportunities to enrich their treasures. Such duties as have recently been imposed on classical antiquities will, of course, prevent their importation with any chance of disposal to any of the museums or private galleries. But it is evidently in vain to rely for relief on "a liberal spirit of interpreting the law," as the appellant usually does. In the words which generally deny his appeal, "relief must be sought from Congress."

—The latest report of the excavations carried on at Olympia by the German commission under Prof. Curtius chronicles among the discoveries made in April the finding of three heads and three torsos in marble, besides numerous inscriptions. The commission is now principally interested in completing the groups of the east pediment of the temple of Zeus. The first found was the head of Kladeos, a river god, which exactly fits the torso found in the first year of the excavations. The whole figure is described as the type of the Greek youths of the best period, but conceived in a somewhat ruder spirit than that of the best statues. The entire left leg of an aged man "seated in a meditative posture" was found at the east end of the Altis, though belonging to the western pediment, a circumstance of importance in connection with the investigation hereafter of the west-end debris. The massive legs and right hand of the colossal figure of the west pediment were discovered about 170 metres from the body. Among the metopes found was a fragment of the helmet of Geryon, a head of Hercules, looking to the right and the third of the kind found last spring. Most of the other important fragments belong to the Roman epoch: a nearly perfect head of Faustina, the wife of Antoninus Pius; a draped and headless figure supposed to be one of the statues of empresses by Metroon; and a number of nude torsos, the remains of idealized portrait-statues apparently, which were dug up from the ruins of a cottage built on the side of the Leonidaion. One of the most important inscriptions discovered is on a pedestal erected by Mummian "to efface the sad memory of the destruction of Corinth by fire." Another is signed by a Macedonian artist, Herophon, hitherto unknown; still another is on the pedestal of the statue of Alexander the Great's messenger, Philonides, mentioned by Pausanias.

—No. 57 of the supplementary numbers of *Petermann's Mittheilungen* contains an exhaustive statistical account of the production of precious metals from the time of the discovery of America to the year 1875, by Professor Soetbeer, of the University of Göttingen. The author mentions in his introductory notice the great difficulties of his task, and acknowledges that many of his figures can only be proximate. Nevertheless, they are as exact as it is possible to make them, no doubt, and are

both valuable and suggestive. There are no trustworthy data down to 1568, when the Frenchman Jean Bodin gave his details of the importation of precious metals from the New World. All later publications on the same subject gain in interest and trustworthiness as the knowledge of the countries in question extends over a wider range. Details of value are found in Sancho de Moncada's work on the same subject (Madrid, 1619), in Ussariz's celebrated 'Teoria y practica del comercio y de la marina' (1740), and in the Abbé Raynal's well-known 'Histoire philosophique et politique des établissements des Européens dans les deux Indes' (Geneva, 1782). Humboldt's statements and statistics on this subject are contained in chapter xi. of his 'Essai politique sur le Royaume de la Nouvelle Espagne' (Paris, 1811). They are distinguished from previous similar publications by a careful enquiry into the product of a few of the most important mining districts during certain limited periods. His figures regarding the gold and silver products of the countries over which he travelled in the beginning of this century, as well as the aggregate amounts of precious metals that had come into the markets of the world from the South American mining districts since their discovery, have been quoted again and again to this day as trustworthy authority. We cannot, however, follow Prof. Soetbeer in his exhaustive critical examination of the sources and material from which his own and other statements have been drawn, and merely give in a tabular form the results of his laborious enquiries:

View of the aggregate Amount of the Production of Precious Metals in the World from 1493 to 1875.

(The weight is in kilogrammes: 1 kilo.=2.20 lbs. avoirdupois. The value is in German marks: 1 mark=about 23.84 cents.)

COUNTRY.	WEIGHT.		VALUE.		
	Silver, Kilogr.	Gold, Kilogr.	Silver in 1,000 Marks.	Gold in 1,000 Marks.	Total Value in 1,000 Marks.
Germany.....	7,904,910	1,422,884	1,422,884
Austria-Hungary.....	7,770,135	460,650	1,398,624	1,285,214	2,683,838
Other European countries.....	7,982,000	1,328,760	1,328,760
Russia.....	2,428,940	1,033,655	437,209	2,883,897	3,321,106
Africa.....	731,600	2,041,164	2,041,164
Mexico.....	76,205,400	265,040	13,716,972	739,462	14,456,434
New Granada.....	1,214,500	8,388,455	8,388,455
Peru.....	31,222,000	163,550	5,619,960	456,304	6,076,264
Bolivia.....	37,717,600	204,000	6,789,168	820,260	7,609,428
Chili.....	2,609,000	263,600	469,620	735,444	1,205,064
Brazil.....	1,037,050	2,893,370	2,893,370
United States.....	5,271,500	2,026,100	948,870	5,652,819	6,601,689
Australia.....	1,812,000	5,055,480	5,055,480
Sundries.....	2,600,000	151,600	300,000	422,964	782,964
Total.....	180,511,485	9,453,345	32,492,067	26,374,833	58,866,900

making in American money a grand total of about \$14,716,725,000. The gold product in Germany and other European countries, as well as the silver product in Africa, New Granada, Brazil, and Australia, is included in "sundries."

—Prof. Soetbeer divides the 362 years from 1493 to 1875 into twenty-five periods of different lengths. In the first (1493-1520) Austria-Hungary ranks first with a total production of the value of 9,900,000 marks. Africa comes next with a gold product of 8,370,000 marks; the West Indies next with a yield of 2,232,000 marks. In the second period (1521-1544) the South American countries come into consideration for the first time: Mexico with a total of 1,198,000 marks; New Granada with 5,580,000; Peru with 6,867,000. In the third period (1545-1560) Potosi in Bolivia heads the list with 35,766,000 marks, almost one-half of the aggregate yield of the world, which amounts during the sixteen years to 79,830,000 marks. Forty years later, from 1580 to 1600, Potosi produced the enormous sum of 49,122,000 marks out of the whole world's total product of 95,992,000. The beginning of the eighteenth century witnessed the development of the rich Mexican silver-mines, which from 1701 to 1720 yielded 163,800 kilogrammes of silver out of an aggregate of 355,600 for the entire production, while New Granada yielded 5,000 kilogrammes of gold out of a total of 12,820. A century later (1801-1810) Mexico reached the fabulous amount of 553,800 kilogrammes of silver, of the value of 99,864,000 marks; New Granada producing during the same period 5,000 kilogrammes of gold, Brazil 3,750, Chili 3,110. The United States appear for the first time in the period 1821-1830 with the modest figure of 110 kilogrammes of gold of the value of 307,000 marks. This is increased for the ten years following (1831-1840) to 850 kilogrammes, valued at 2,372,000 marks. The last years of the following decade revolutionize

the gold market by the discovery of the California gold-mines, and the United States take the second place with a gold product of 17,600 kilogrammes (next to Russia with 22,515 kilogrammes). In the five years from 1850 to 1855 the United States yielded the greatest amount of gold ever produced in any country during the same period—88,800 kilogrammes, valued at 247,752,000 marks, or nearly one-half of the total gold product of the world, which amounted during these five years to 197,515 kilogrammes. A formidable rival sprang up in the same period, Australia producing 67,700 kilogrammes. The production of these five years has never been reached since in the United States. In the following five years (1856-1860) Australia stands first with a total of 86,700 kilogrammes of gold; the United States next, with 77,100 kilogrammes. The following period (1861-1865) is that of the first development of the silver-mines of Nevada, the United States producing 174,000 kilogrammes of silver against 6,200 kilogrammes for the five preceding years, and second only to Mexico with 473,000. The last period of Prof. Soetbeer's estimate (1871-1875) shows a total production of 1,969,425 kilogrammes of silver, and 170,675 of gold. Mexico comes first with a silver product of 601,800 kilogrammes; the United States next with 561,800 kilogrammes; Bolivia next with 222,500 kilogrammes. The principal gold-producing countries are: Australia with 59,900 kilogrammes, the United States with 59,500 kilogrammes, Russia with 33,380 kilogrammes. A final table in Prof. Soetbeer's book gives a view of the production of precious metals during the twenty-five years from 1851 to 1875:

COUNTRY.	WEIGHT.		VALUE.		Total val. in million marks.
	Silver, Kilogr.	Gold, Kilogr.	Silver in million marks.	Gold in million marks.	
Australia.....	1,812,000	5,055.5	5,055.5
United States.....	5,271,500	1,840,500	948.9	5,135.0	6,083.9
Mexico and South America.....	18,570,500	231,935	3,342.6	647.1	3,989.7
Russia.....	397,790	694,080	71.6	1,936.5	2,008.1
Other countries.....	6,763,745	177,850	1,217.5	496.2	1,713.7
Total.....	31,003,535	4,756,365	5,580.6	13,270.3	18,850.9

—Prof. J. D. Butler writes us from Madison, Wis., under date of August 30:

"The Genoese ambassador in England mentioned in your last number was by no means the only European who at no time deceived himself about the causes or chances of our Revolutionary struggle. Another noteworthy instance is Frederic the Great. The father of Sir John Moore, 'interviewing' that monarch in the summer of 1776, thus writes:

"He said there were accounts from Holland that the English troops had been driven from Boston, and that the Americans were in possession of that place. I told him that our letters informed us that the army had left Boston to make an attack with more effect elsewhere. He smiled and said: 'If you will not allow the retreat to have been an affair of necessity, you will at least admit that it was *tout-à-fait à-propos*.' He observed that it was a difficult thing to govern men by force at such a distance; that if the Americans should be beat (which appeared a little problematical), it would be next to impossible to draw a revenue from them by taxation, etc. He concluded by saying: 'Eh bien, Messieurs, je ne comprend pas ces choses-là, je n'ai point de colonie: j'espère que vous vous tirerez bien d'affaire, mais elle me paraît un peu épineuse.'"

This testimony from the first soldier in Europe has not, I think, been before drawn out of the obscurity of a forgotten volume of travels."

—We find in the *Perseveranza* of August 17-19 some interesting speculations on the future distribution of languages and nationalities on the globe, by E. Littré. He imagines Strabo, at the time of the greatest expansion of the Roman Empire, conjecturing that the world, or at least the ancient world, would ultimately be filled with the Latin name; and yet nothing of the kind has occurred. The globe then had neither been traversed nor measured, and the unknown portion was too vast. In our time calculations can be made without risk of being confounded by the discovery of new regions, or new races of mankind. M. Littré begins with what he calls the Britannic group, and concludes that at no distant day the English-speaking peoples will number three or four hundred millions. The race which immediately challenges comparison with it is the Chinese, already arrived at that figure. So long as it remains inferior, in point of science, to the nations of Europe, M. Littré expects no great modification in its conditions. Perhaps he underrates the readiness of the Chinese to leave their native country, though he pays in passing a compliment to President Hayes for maintaining the sacredness of treaties against the "unbridled liberty" of Congress. Of the obstacles to their assimilation with the peoples who receive them he makes no mention. Russia is his third colossus, and his fourth the Spanish race, to which he consigns without a rival all of South America, except Brazil and the European colonies on the northeast coast. No other European race can dream of competing with these, unless it be Portugal. He assumes it as

certain that the vast territory of Brazil, capable of sustaining a hundred millions of inhabitants, will be all placed to the credit of Portugal in the partition of the globe. That one destiny and one nationality will finally unite the Brazilian littoral with the valley of the Amazon is, it seems to us, scarcely more than a probability. Germany has no chance in the contest; France can do nothing unless by encroachments on northern and central Africa. In the East, British rule in India may so lighten with science the native subjects that independence will be the result, in which case the Indian race must be counted one of the chief factors in the problem. Modern science might even revive the Arab influence over a wide area, but the Turks have had their day. Anglo-Saxon, Russian, and Spanish fecundity will eventually make the Christians outnumber all other religionists. The full development of Russia and the United States menaces possibly the independence of the non-expansive European States, and is quite likely to alter their rank in the scale of greatness. M. Littré hopes, however, that the progress of civilization will provide the same safeguards for the life of states that it has done for the life of men. The seat of the highest culture may, as was fancied by the author of the 'Vestiges of Creation' ("a remarkable book, written some twenty years ago in the United States by an Irishman"), some day be transferred from the banks of the Seine to beyond the Hudson and the Susquehanna; but there is no evidence that the result for Europe will at all resemble the effect on Babylon, Syria, Asia Minor, and Egypt of the passage of civilization from the East to the West.

HERBERT SPENCER'S DATA OF ETHICS.*

THE facts of evolution have crowded upon the thinking world so fast within the last few years that their philosophy has fared rather hard. Chaotic cohorts of outlandish associates, the polyp's tentacles, the throat of the pitcher-plant, the nest of the bower-bird, the illuminated hind-quarters of the baboon, and the manners and customs of the Dyaks and Andamanese, have swept like a deluge into the decent gardens in which, with her disciples, refined Philosophy was wont to pace, and have left but little of their human and academic scenery erect. Many of the previous occupants, though broken-hearted at the desecration, have submitted, in a sort of pessimistic despair, to the barbarian invaders. Others, temporarily routed, are uncertain what to do. The victors meanwhile, intoxicated with success, assume, for the most part, that Philosophy herself is dead, or that, if she still has vitality enough left to continue propounding any of her silly conundrums, she will be shamed to silence, as now one, now another, of the conquering ragged regiment stands forth to face her down. We are the truth and the whole truth, they cry. Emotion, in short, has paralyzed reflection on both sides, as it always does in sudden revolutions. But when the newcomers grow accustomed to their situation, and the original possessors get better acquainted with their strange bedfellows, things will settle down on very much the old basis. Mr. Spencer's successors will probably not feel, as he now does, that the study of the habits of filthy savages is far better than that of the lives of illustrious Europeans; and it will then be seen that questions as to the fundamental elements of existence, the fundamental grounds for belief, and the fundamental reasons for action and endurance, remain to be discussed as subtly after as before we learned that each phenomenon was evolved and had a peculiar history of its own.

The question about action is the most urgent of all, and it is therefore matter of rejoicing that such an incarnation, such a perfect saw-mill, we were going to say, of evolutionism as Mr. Spencer should have seen fit to publish his Ethics in advance of their proper place in the work to which he has devoted his life. He has been led to do this, he tells us in his preface, from the fear that failing health may perhaps force him to leave unexecuted that final part of his immense task to which he has always regarded all the rest as subsidiary. "My ultimate purpose, lying behind all proximate purposes, has been that of finding for the principles of right and wrong, in conduct at large, a scientific basis." He adds that the volume now published, though it cannot, of course, contain all the specific conclusions to be set forth in the entire 'Principles of Morality,' of which it forms a part, yet implies them in such wise that definitely to formulate them requires nothing beyond logical deduction. These two hundred and eighty pages contain, then, the essence of Mr. Spencer's life-long meditations on human life. It is easy to feel, in the carefulness of the composition, the wealth of illustration, and clean-cut

perspicuity of the style, that the author has done his very best to make the form worthy of the matter, and to render the book, if possible, a popular classic on the subject of which it treats. Such being the case, we shall best fulfil our reviewer's function by endeavoring to give as faithful a report as possible of its contents, unmixed with criticisms which, made on such a work in so brief a space, could not but appear shallow, or even impertinent.

Mr. Spencer's fundamental ideas are very simple. In the first place, we must, he says, in order to discuss rightness and wrongness in human conduct, have a fixed point from which to make our measurements. Such a point may be called Absolute Ethics, the conduct of the perfect man. But an ideally perfect man cannot be conceived to exist except in an ideally perfect social state. An absolutely just or perfectly sympathetic person could not maintain himself in a tribe of cannibals. To lay down the conditions of this perfect social state is then the purpose of the present volume. First and foremost, then, it is the state towards which evolution inevitably tends. This all-important assumption is one which Mr. Spencer takes no pains to justify here. Probably the inductive proof of it will be given in the unpublished volumes of the 'Principles of Sociology.' The deductive proof would probably run somewhat in this way: All social discord is friction; all friction makes resistance; all resistance ends, if prolonged, by stopping motion. The motions of society will thus perforce come to run exclusively in lines without resistance—that is to say, that the tendencies of each social unit will eventually harmonize with and be aided by the movements of the other units, and of the whole. If we grant that this is the inevitable upshot, we must see that this final condition is the one of all most favorable to extent of life, for not only is, by the hypothesis, every incompletely evolved degree of life accompanied by some murderous friction, but Mr. Spencer shows, in a chapter on "The Evolution of Conduct," that, taken in a broad sense, all action is for the maintenance of life, and that those forms of action which prevail where by common consent existence is most evolved (as in pacific and industrial human societies) are also those where life has the greatest length and "breadth"—by which latter word Mr. Spencer means variety, "depth" being a dimension for which no equivalent exists in his scheme—and where it is least exposed to waste or sacrifice.

Consequently, then, the perfect state, the definitively final state, and the state of maximum vitality are all synonymous terms. Every step towards one of these ends is a step towards the others. But what general end guides the steps of human beings? Happiness or pleasure—this is the universal object of pursuit; and Mr. Spencer shows that even those ethical theories whose avowed first principle is not "hedonistic," really do make conduciveness to happiness or unhappiness the test by which conduct shall be judged virtuous or the reverse. Does, then, the line of greatest happiness coincide with the three other lines of tendency which we have traced, so that those who pursue happiness will find that at the same time "evolution," perfection, and the maximum of this earth's life have been added to their portion? Most emphatically so, says our author; and whatever appearances may speak to the contrary do so only because they are interpreted in the light of too narrow an experience. This is another cardinal pivot of his doctrine, and is so important a matter that it is to be regretted that he has not gone more thoroughly into its discussion. He seems to content himself with a brief repetition of the theory advanced in his 'Psychology,' that any creature which should be made happy by actions noxious to its welfare, and unhappy by useful conduct, would end by expiating with its life its ill-adjusted æsthetic constitution. We find many misadjustments, it is true, in human beings, but these, like the love of murderous "sport" in industrial communities, are survivals from an older predatory social state, and are already dying out; or else, like drink, theft, murder, etc., are causing their unfortunate subjects to perish more rapidly than the rest of mankind.

Thus, little by little, none but life-subserving tendencies to behavior will remain. In a number of chapters Mr. Spencer tries to show what the complexion of the behavior must necessarily be among mankind if life is to flourish in a maximum degree. It must not be anarchic, nor, when social states are formed, must their mutual attitude be that of war. Though self-regard be for each individual the primary virtue, yet it must be so transmuted by sympathy that we shall preserve ourselves for the sake of our uses to mankind. Altruism and egoism will, however, be so justly balanced that "each takes care that others shall have their altruistic satisfactions; the highest altruism being that which ministers not to the egoistic satisfactions of others only, but also to their altruistic satisfactions. Far off as seems such a state, yet every one of the factors counted on to produce it may already be traced in operation among those

* 'The Data of Ethics. By Herbert Spencer.' New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1879.

of highest natures. What now in them is occasional and feeble may be expected with further evolution to become habitual and strong; and what now characterizes the exceptionally high may be expected eventually to characterize all. For that which the best human nature is capable of is within the reach of human nature at large. . . . Although latent ideas will exist of the evils which non-conformity with perfect rectitude will bring, "these will occupy the mind no more than do ideas of the evils of starvation at the time when a healthy appetite is being satisfied by a meal." Nay, more; Mr. Spencer's is usually reckoned a dry sort of imagination, but can we longer so consider it when we read his Fourier-like account, in §94, of the way in which our facial expressions, our bodily movements, and our vocal cadences will become transfigured after our feelings have become all sympathetic, and there is no longer any utility in concealing any part of them from our companions?

Mark that in this perfectly-evolved condition all our virtue is to flow spontaneously from our natural constitution. There will be no self-compulsion in our justice, nor shall we be aware in the midst of our righteous behavior that we are acting for any ulterior end other than the love of the behavior itself. Increasing the total amount of vitality on earth will be far from the thoughts of most of us, unless, indeed, perchance the theory as well as the practice of evolution shall have become ingrained into the nervous systems of us all. This matter of blind spontaneity in virtue, resulting from the *means* acquiring an intrinsic attractiveness which makes it an immediate object of pursuit, and drives the *end* out of consciousness altogether, is much insisted on by our author as distinguishing his own from other ethical systems. These all, however, embody portions of the truth, and this is how he briefly awards to each its share:

"The theological theory contains a part. If for the divine will supernaturally revealed we substitute the naturally revealed end towards which the power manifested throughout evolution works, then, since evolution has been and is still working towards the highest life, it follows that conforming to those principles by which the highest life is achieved is furthering that end. The doctrine that perfection or excellence of nature should be the object of pursuit, is in one sense true; for it tacitly recognizes that ideal form of being which the highest life implies, and to which evolution tends. There is a truth, also, in the doctrine that virtue must be the aim; for this is another form of the doctrine that the aim must be to fulfil the conditions to the achievement of the highest life. That the intuitions of a moral faculty should guide our conduct, is a proposition in which a truth is contained; for these intuitions are the slowly organized results of experiences received by the race while living in presence of these conditions. And that happiness is the supreme end is beyond question true; for this is the concomitant of that highest life which every theory of moral guidance has distinctly or vaguely in view."

If now I, a defective and imperfectly evolved creature, full of joy of battle and other survivals from a savage state, say to Mr. Spencer: "I know nothing of your highest life, or, knowing, despise it"; and if I add to my other riotous deeds the sneering at evolution and the writing of sarcasms on its eventual milk-and-water paradise, saying I prefer to go on like my ancestors and enjoy this delicious mess of fears and strivings, and agonies and exultations, of dramatic catastrophes and supernatural visions, of excesses, in short, in every direction, which make of human life the rich contradictory tissue of good and evil it now is, how shall Mr. Spencer reduce me to order or coerce me to bow the knee? He is impotent over me by any theoretic appeal, and frankly confesses as much. Moral obligation he admits (p. 127) to be a transitory element in the moral life, and he tries with considerable originality to show how the sense of it arises by association of wrong conduct with external natural penalties and social restraints. With advancing evolution and increasing, orderly spontaneity, the coerciveness of the *ought* will little by little disappear. Even now I *ought* to do a thing only on *condition* that I dread certain consequences from the not doing of it. If I do not happen to dread them, I go free. This polemically weak point Mr. Spencer shares with all hedonistic or otherwise confessedly subjective systems of morality. His only superiority over them is this: that he has one more material bribe to offer me in behalf of virtue than they, one more bugbear to deter me from the path of vice. Your way will inevitably fail, he can say. Evolution's fatal tide will leave you naked, and high and dry, unless you join it. But if I am so ill-conditioned as to prefer remaining alone as a spectacle of impotent perversity to the ages, his *arguments* are at an end, and he must resort to brute force, if to anything, in order to lead me at his chariot-wheel.

And here comes in the peculiar personal bias of Mr. Spencer in this ethical matter. Whereas to all other evolutionary moralists the *status belli* has received a new consecration from the new ideas; whereas in Germany especially the "struggle for existence" has been made the bap-

tismal formula for the most cynical assertions of brute egoism; with Mr. Spencer the same theories have bred an almost Quakerish humanitarianism and regard for peace. Frequently in these pages does his indignation at the ruling powers of Britain burst forth, for their policy of conquest over lower races. Might, in his eyes, would hardly seem to be right, even when evolution is carried on by its means. And this brings us to the only criticism we care to make: We can never on evolutionist principles altogether bar out personal bias, or the subjective method, from the construction of the ethical standard of right, however fatalistic we may be. For if *what is right* means *what succeeds*, however fatally doomed to succeed that thing may be, it yet succeeds through the determinate acts of determinate individuals; and until it has been revealed what *shall* succeed, we are all free to "go in" for our preferences and try to make them right by making them victorious. Now, it may be strictly true that, as Mr. Spencer says, no preference of ours possibly *can* succeed in the long run, unless, with its other contents, it be also a preference for peace, justice, and sympathy. But we still are free to decide *when* to settle down on the equitable and peaceful basis. A postponement of fifty years may wipe the Sioux and Zulus out of the game, and with them the type of character which they represent. Evolutionists must not forget that we all have five fingers merely because the first vertebrate above the fishes *happened* to have that number. He owed his prodigious success in founding a line of descent to some entirely other quality—we know not which as yet—but the inessential five fingers were taken in tow and preserved to the present day. So of minor moral points; we have to decide which of them the peace and sympathy shall take in tow and carry on to triumph. What kind of fellows shall we be willing to be peaceful with, and whose sympathy shall we enjoy? An unlettered workingman of the writer's acquaintance once made the profound remark: "There's very little difference betwixt one man and another, but what little there is is *very* important." Shall we settle down to peaceful competition already now with the Chinese? shall our messmates in the millennial equilibrium be of the fat-minded Esquimaux type? or shall we put up with some generations more of *status belli* in order to get a good congenial working majority of artists, metaphysicians, wits, and yearners after the ineffable with whom we may live contented? According to evolution each human type and exemplar of character has small beginnings, like everything else. The "best" is that which has the biggest endings. Mine may have these if I get ahead and violently crush yours out *in time*; yours, if I let the precious occasion slip and you outgrow and suppress me. For the conditions which once produced me, just as I am, may never recur again.

Mr. Spencer has forgotten to consider this inevitable field of warring antipathies, in which each must just fight doggedly and hope the event may prove him right. Or probably he has not so much forgotten as contemned it in his vast dream of universal fatalism. His work contains masses of strikingly expressed criticism and illustration of the incoherence of our actual ethical standards. It is certain to form a powerful centre of crystallization for the fluid thought of recent days, and is, it seems to us after this first perusal, decidedly the most noteworthy production of its energetic author.

SEELEY'S LIFE AND TIMES OF STEIN.*

II.

PROFESSOR SEELEY has discovered a great historical revolution. Side by side with the English and the French Revolutions we must now, on his view, place "a third revolution not less important than either, which is the Spanish Revolution." Its importance consists, first, in its having given a new character to the struggle against Napoleon; secondly, in its having inaugurated the movement in favor of oppressed nationalities which has changed Italy into a nation and Germany into an empire. That any theory propounded by a man of Mr. Seeley's knowledge and talent contains elements of truth and deserves consideration, may be assumed as a matter of course; and whoever reads the 'Life and Times of Stein' will see that the book brings into prominence matters, such as the moral influence exerted throughout Europe by the Spanish insurrection, which do not always receive due weight at the hands of historians. But when every concession which is due to Mr. Seeley's learning and ability is made, the question still remains, What is the real worth of his discovery? has he revealed a new aspect of history, or has he sim-

* 'Life and Times of Stein; or, Germany and Prussia in the Napoleonic Age. By J. R. Seeley, M.A., Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge.' London, 1879. Boston: Roberts Bros.

ply exaggerated a truism till it appears like a paradox? After careful consideration of Mr. Seeley's work candid students will, we are convinced, find it impossible to answer these questions in a way satisfactory to the professor's admirers. The discovery of a "Spanish Revolution" as full of import as the great French Revolution is certainly of more solid value than the discovery that Cobden was as truly an historian as Macaulay. But the introduction into history of a new revolution is, after all, an achievement due rather to literary ingenuity than to historical insight. For the account given of the Anti-Napoleonic Revolution, in so far as it is more than a statement of facts known to all persons and fully appreciated by all competent students, rests on a very one-sided version of the struggle against Napoleon, and on a very doubtful estimate of the importance and character of the movement which, according to the tone of Professor Seeley's work, was first revealed to the world by the Spanish insurrection, much as the first French Revolution was made patent to the world by the fall of the Bastille.

That Mr. Seeley's version of the contest with Napoleon does not square with all the facts of the case is, we think, obvious. The steadfast resistance of the Spanish nation to the imperial invader was undoubtedly an important and startling phenomenon, but the Spanish people were not the first to reveal the difference between a nation and a state. The whole contest between England and Napoleon exhibited to the world the force derived from national spirit. It was England, not Spain, which first pitted the strength of united patriotism against the gigantic force of imperial power. It was England, not Spain, which stood in the way of Napoleonic policy. The war in the Peninsula derived its permanent importance far more from its affording a field for the display of Wellington's generalship than from the strength of the insurgents, and at least one competent critic has doubted whether British resources might not have produced more speedy results if they had been employed nearer the centre of the imperial power, instead of being to a certain extent cooped up within the limits of Spain. The soldiers who cheered the English general as "the chap who knew how to leather the French," saw clearly one aspect of the war which Professor Seeley shows a tendency to overlook. Years of warfare had revealed to one general, at least, the secret of success. Napoleon trained up, so to speak, his own destroyers. From the minute when it was made manifest that tactics could be found which baffled the armies of the Empire, the charm was broken, and it became all but certain that the number of Napoleon's foes would at last crush the power even of his genius.

Nor, taking Professor Seeley's own account of the Anti-Napoleonic Revolution, does it appear that in Spain, Germany, or Russia popular insurrection achieved as much as is even by ordinary writers put down to the credit of popular enthusiasm. The people rising "as one man" is an impressive idea, but those who count on the effectiveness of patriotic insurrection should remember Palmerston's dictum, that if the people rise as one man they are extremely apt to be at once knocked down as one man. Palmerston remembered the Napoleonic wars, and drew from his remembrance the indubitably right conclusion that trained armies, not popular enthusiasm, are the one means of resisting a power based on military force. National enthusiasm no doubt contributed an element of importance to the struggle with Napoleon, but after all he fell before the combined states of Europe, and was but very indirectly the victim of aroused national feeling; and if the Napoleonic Empire fell partly because it outraged the growing sentiment of Spanish and German patriotism, it owed its fall at least as much to the conservative forces which had always opposed the Revolution. It was no mere accident that the ruin of the Empire led to the restoration of the Bourbons. The diplomatists who met at Vienna aimed, in the main, first, at guarding against future French aggressions; and, secondly, at restoring what may be termed the principle of legitimacy. The one thing they did not regard was national aspirations, and this oversight in the long run broke up their arrangements and gave birth to the doctrine of nationality, which has disturbed and remodelled the states of Europe during the last forty years. It is, however, of great importance to recollect what Mr. Seeley seems practically to overlook, that the enthusiasm for nationality was excited far more by the settlement intended to prevent the revival of Napoleonic power than by the aggressions of Napoleon, and that the revolution of the nineteenth century, if so it may be called, has its parentage not in Germany or in Spain, but in Italy, and that its heroes will always be, not Stein or Fichte, but Mazzini, Cavour, and Garibaldi.

That the movement in favor of nationality which has colored the politics of the nineteenth century cannot, even if Mr. Seeley be right in connecting it with the Spanish insurrection, be placed on anything like

the same level as the French Revolution, may not be at first sight obvious to all our readers, but is nevertheless a position in which persons who weigh carefully the true character of political, social, or moral changes will, on reflection, acquiesce. The nature of the so-called French Revolution is obscured by the name which the greatest of all changes since the Reformation has received. The revolutionary movement in France was a part, and not, perhaps, in the long run, the most important part, of a general revolution throughout Europe, which may, in very general terms, be described as the effort of the European world to shake off the influence of feudalism. From its very birth the revolutionary spirit broke down national barriers and divided nations into parties, zeal for which overpowered local patriotism. Burke who denounced, the revolutionists who applauded, De Tocqueville who criticised, the Revolution, each at any rate perceived that, to use Burke's language, it "broke the locality of public affections," or that, to cite De Tocqueville's words, "*elle a formé au dessus de toutes les nationalités particulières une patrie intellectuelle commune, dont les hommes de toutes les nations ont pu devenir citoyens.*" Hence followed the result, which Mr. Seeley hardly appears to appreciate, that the Napoleonic Empire, the defeats and successes of the governments opposed to France, form only episodes in a movement of which the course has not yet run out. Hence, further, the Revolution influenced different countries at different dates. The ideas which have worked visibly in France since 1789 moulded the course of English politics in 1832, still convulsed Europe in 1848, and cannot yet be said to have lost their power. To judge of the Revolution viewed as a great effort to emancipate mankind from moral and intellectual prejudices, and from political oppression, it is vain to look at single events marking its course. To estimate the great changes of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries by the Reign of Terror, by the pacific triumph of 1830, or by the follies of 1848, is as vain as to test the merits or defects of the Reformation by the massacre of St. Bartholomew, by the defeat of the Armada, or by the horrors of the Thirty Years' War. All that mankind can as yet say is that a great effort to realize great ideas has caused some great calamities, and has not yet been crowned with complete success.

The moment the Revolution is regarded as a whole, the impossibility of balancing against it the movement in favor of nationality becomes apparent. This movement, whatever its worth, was to a great extent an effort of reaction. Admiration is due to Spanish patriotism, but it was mainly the patriotism of ignorance, and one may be permitted to doubt whether the worst effect of Napoleonic rapacity was not that in Spain it forced virtue and patriotism into an unnatural alliance with dulness and fanaticism against enlightenment and improvement. To the German war of liberation it is possible to give far more unmixed sympathy, principally because the enthusiasm which resisted the tyranny of Napoleon was also aroused against the still baser despotism of petty German potentates; but those who mark the really brutal language in which a person so eminent as Stein could in his old age address gentlemen engaged with him in public business, may feel that the revolutionary doctrine of so-called equality needed after the Napoleonic wars, as it probably still needs, to be impressed on Germans trained under the influence of feudal ideas. The nationality movement, again, never could from its nature be a universal movement. It has no application to a country such as England, nor had it till 1870 any application to France. The doctrine of nationality is, in short, either, as it was in Italy, a form under which people protest against oppression (in which case it may ally itself with revolutionary dogmas), or it is a reactionary movement against not only the errors but also some of the truest conceptions of the eighteenth century. The cry for nationality, if made an end in itself, may rouse race against race, on the ground, not of resistance to oppression, but of some supposed right to constitute a nation. Compared with the so-called French Revolution, the movement termed by Professor Seeley the "Spanish Revolution" sinks, even when looked at as a whole, into comparative insignificance. The great Revolution is a European movement in favor, in the main, of rational principles applicable to the whole civilized world. The nationalist movement is either the revolutionary spirit under a disguised, and in some sense improved, form, or it is a reaction, which no doubt has a side of romance, but which from its nature appeals to local feelings, and therefore to what may be termed limited principles; which leads its votaries to aim rather at romantic ideals than at the attainment of good government; which may aid the cause of freedom in Italy, but which may foster military government in Germany or aggression in Russia. The revolution, in short, which Professor Seeley has discovered is, to speak plainly, no discovery, and has, further, no claim to be compared in importance with the great revolutions of the world.

THREE BRITISH VIEWS OF AMERICA.*

NOTHING could better illustrate the change which has taken place within comparatively few years in the attitude of the educated British public towards this country than these three books. They are, to be sure, written by British Liberals, who have for some time now had an interest in manifesting a certain American bias; whose American bias is, indeed, more or less the logical outcome of their distinctive principles. After Mr. Bright's championship, and considering the enthusiasm for "popular institutions" of the more radical of his party, it is not surprising that we should have gained so many advocates and admirers among his countrymen as to account for the conservative indignation awakened by Mr. Gladstone's recent article on "Kin Beyond Sea." But the Englishman may usually be so completely trusted to maintain the bias of patriotism that one is not altogether prepared for the heartiness of appreciation, the unprejudiced investigation, the evident predisposition towards not only our political "institutions," but our habits, manners, character, and institutions of all kinds, exhibited by Mr. Dale, Sir George Campbell, and Mr. Saunders in about equal proportions. Of course they by no means see everything in rose-color, and of course discrimination is quite as characteristic of their examination as candor is of their temper; but that their temper should be so unlike that one not unfrequently notices in English papers—for example, in the comments on the speeches of Rev. Mr. Talmage, recently—and yet so far removed from anything sentimental on the other hand, is matter for some surprise, perhaps, as well as for satisfaction. Sir George Campbell especially takes great pains to controvert, or rather expose, Mr. Trollope, who was prejudiced in his account of us possibly by a sentiment of filial piety. He notes, with well-bred astonishment that they should have been made, a score of Mr. Trollope's misconceptions and misreports and is as emphatic as any American could desire in his condemnation of them. And in each of these volumes we are a long way not only from the temper of the "American Notes," which was to have been expected, but also from the much more recent provincialism—still characteristic of serious English periodicals—of supposing even geographical blunders concerning "the States" trivial which, if made concerning the centre of Africa, would be deemed unpardonable.

Mr. Dale and Sir George Campbell spent but two months here; Mr. Saunders a much longer time, and so was enabled to make his examination more complete and searching. Mr. Dale's book, indeed, is entitled 'Impressions' with accurate modesty. He appears to have visited out of New England only the larger cities of the North, and to have been excellently taken care of by the ministers of his own denomination in New Haven and elsewhere. Sir George Campbell certainly made the most of his time, and took an extended trip through the South, making it a special point to investigate the relations of the whites and blacks and the condition, social and political, of the States which had recently "thrown off the carpet-bag rule" when he visited them. Mr. Dale considers, in four separate chapters, "Society," "Politics," "Popular Education," and "Religion," respectively, and his conclusions are of a general and comprehensive nature. Sir George Campbell's survey was perhaps as cursory—at least, one infers it to have been necessarily so from the far larger field which he covered in the same time; but he has an extraordinarily acute power of observation, he is an unusually experienced traveller, who was but yesterday "round" at China, and he confines himself to strict reporting and the simplest inductions, without attempting to systematize his inferences into the shape of a parliamentary commission's practical report. This last is done by Mr. Saunders much more thoroughly than by either of the other writers. He does, indeed, permit himself an abundance of general observations, but he made the subject of government, its comparative cost, extent, and practical workings here and in his own country; the system of bank management, the temperance question, the railway question, the land question, matters of especial and systematic investigation. We should say that his book was the most valuable from a political and industrial point of view; Sir George Campbell's from a social and literary, possibly human, standpoint; and Mr. Dale's for its educational chapter and the conciseness of its summing up.

Mr. Dale thinks us "a very reserved people," except in the matter of religion, which he found many persons—chiefly evangelical and accustomed to prayer-meeting frankness, perhaps—ready to talk about. As a rule, he concludes we are undemonstrative, which he attributes to New England

influence, and not given to making a fuss, which he thinks due perhaps to the military discipline we got during the civil war. We are so apt to ascribe social demoralization to that event that we are inclined to doubt this, though the explanations of Sir George Campbell and Mr. Saunders, who note the same trait, are not perhaps more satisfactory. Sir George Campbell thinks it possibly due to direct English influence, and Mr. Saunders to the marching to the sound of the piano practised in the public schools—a form of discipline hardly old enough, we imagine, to have yet had universal influence. "To an English radical," Mr. Dale observes, "the conservatism of the people generally is very striking." He thinks that transported to England they would, after speedily disestablishing the national Church, join the ranks of the Conservative party. Mr. Saunders, on the contrary, says that the American would be very likely to look at the question of disestablishment in a practical way. "He would make himself acquainted with what the Church was doing, how far the work was useful, and what it cost the state; and it would be upon a balance of advantages to the community that an American would decide for or against disestablishment." Mr. Dale also thinks we have an almost superstitious respect for the rights of property. Mr. Saunders, on the contrary, says: "Public interests are regarded as being of far more importance than the rights of property, or private rights of any kind." Mr. Dale even finds a distrust of popular institutions "far from uncommon among the wealthier and educated classes." As to politics, he says: "America is the paradise of Home-Rulers"; he deplores the condition of the civil service—from responsibility for which he relieves Jefferson on the authority of Mr. Parton, by the way—credits Mr. Hayes with excellent intentions, but says Mr. Conkling's course illustrates "the magnitude of the task which the President has undertaken." As to the tariff, he makes the neat observation that "the unquiet ghosts of Lord George Bentinck's speeches are still 'walking' in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey." He views with some trepidation the hostility of "the Roman Catholic hierarchy" to the public schools, but still thinks its defeat certain, as any other result "would imply a complete revolution in the spirit and temper and habits of the nation." The subject of education, as we have said, he treats exhaustively; he notes the lack of grammar-schools, which he deplores, but thinks the elementary schools far in advance of those of England, though he finds much to criticise in our elementary education—among other things, that "the teaching is too good," the teacher does too much, with result of too much memorizing and too little discipline. His chapter on "Religion" is very nearly all sympathetic praise. One paragraph is worth quoting:

"Our temper is, therefore, a 'militant' temper. I do not think that among my friends in America there was really less of Evangelical zeal, but they seemed to be less impressed by the constant presence of hostile forces which it was their first business to subdue. They were under less tension. They had more religious rest. They seemed to live at home—not in a camp. To me there was something very charming in the change."

And, remembering that Mr. Dale comes from Birmingham and is so expert in ecclesiastical and other controversy, there is something very charming, we may add, in this testimony.

Sir George Campbell is not what one would call a literary artist; there is a kind of frankness of attitude and hearty, good-humored disregard for the graces of composition in him which makes his book lacking somewhat in proportion and arrangement. Part of it is lectures delivered familiarly to various Scotch audiences, part is an article republished from the *Fortnightly Review*, part selections from a very copious journal which he kept during his trip. Despite this, or possibly owing to this, his book is an effective one. There is, for one thing, no possibility of suspecting it of any *arrière-pensée*. One goes along with the writer as trustfully as if he were having the same actual experience. Furthermore, Sir George Campbell's perceptions being as acute as his temper is candid, one feels the unlikelihood of his being humbugged by any one—a danger to be avoided certainly in a tour through the South—or misled by anything; seriously, that is to say. And as he has a quick eye for what is picturesque, and is, perhaps, a good deal of an artist by disposition without suspecting it or evincing it in his style and manner, his observations have an interest that is at times even vivid, as well as an air of trustworthiness. He sets out by telling his readers that our manners and language are based upon a foundation almost entirely English, and that what are called "Yankeeisms" are really obsolete English expressions. Naturally, too, he "found that an immense number of the best and most prominent men wherever I went claimed Scotch descent," and regrets that the founders of the Republic "didn't introduce a little Scotch cooking"; he found even oatmeal called "Irish oatmeal," and presumably came across no "haggis" at all. Speaking of other races and the emigration from New England

* 'Impressions of America.' By R. W. Dale. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1879.

* 'White and Black. The Outcome of a Visit to the United States.' By Sir George Campbell, M.P. London: Chatto & Windus; New York: R. Worthington. 1879.

* 'Through the Light Continent; or, the United States in 1877-8.' By William Saunders. London, Paris, and New York: Cassell, Petter & Galpin. 1879.

westward, he thinks "it would be a very curious thing if Puritan New England became a Roman Catholic Irish colony," as indeed it would. The typical "Daisy Millers" were all in Europe when he was here; the independence of "our girls" he decidedly likes, and "American women are among the nicest of their sex." The typical Yankee was "just a month fra Glasca." Political meetings are so orderly as to be dull. The cities are too big; in connection with which he appositely remarks: "I am almost tempted to say that for every man who works with his hands there seem to be two who seek to live by speculating upon him." No one sees America who does not see the small farmers who are the backbone of the country. Higher education somewhat disappointed him: "there is still a good deal of Latin and Greek taught." In raceality we are about on a par with England, though we sometimes punish our rascals "more adequately." He does not think that religion is "suited to the genius of the people of America, white or black"; from which opinion Mr. Saunders as well as Mr. Dale dissents. All three note a national preference for dearness over cheapness, which leads Sir George to advise winning a fortune here and spending it abroad.

This brings us to the most valuable part of his book, his statement of the condition of the South—especially valuable to an American. "I think the tone and temper of the people of the Southern States is very highly to be praised," he says at the outset; but his praise is by no means indiscriminate. The rapid civilization of the blacks through their political education surprises him, and he contrasts it with the slow improvement of the white serfs of Europe. In industrial arts, however, they have made, he says, almost no progress whatever. They are "inaccurate," "lacking in mechanical skill," do not make good factory operatives, and so on. Mr. Saunders notes, by the way, that where from any cause, such as climate, they do not come into direct competition with the whites, necessity has educated them to an equality with whites, even in factory labor. The notion that the blacks are improvident, in raising only enough to eat, Sir George says is false. On the contrary, they raise what will bring them the most money, and import bacon and corn from the West. However, they live too freely to save money to buy land and make themselves independent, as they might. Their migratory tendency he explains on the ground that they did not feel free till they had changed their place of living. The best class of the blacks is to be found in South Carolina, where more has been done for them and where they have done more for themselves. Beginning under unusual disadvantages, they now make a living where the whites could not—e. g., in growing Sea Island cotton. The general condition of the negroes throughout the South is good, and the industrial relations between the races unstrained. His advice to the blacks is to "stay at home and make the best of an excellent situation," and to the whites, "Do all you can to keep this people, conciliate them, and make the most of them." As to the matter of carpet-bag rule and its succession of "bulldozing," the writer manages to steer a very successful middle course between the "shot-gun" Scylla and the Stalwart Charybdis, it seems to us. At any rate, he preserves a quiet, "low tone" in treating the matter, which, if it pleases men of neither extreme, gives no comfort to their respective opponents, and furnishes small material for stump-speeches in Maine or Georgia.

Mr. Saunders's book is, as already mentioned, exhaustive, and has a permanent value. We have left ourselves only space enough to speak of a

few of its more salient points; some of its statistics are worth giving. In considering the liquor question he finds that 47,000,000 of people here consume £93,000,000; whereas 33,000,000 in the United Kingdom consume £142,000,000; according to the alcoholic test—that is, taking the alcohol in spirits at 50 per cent., in wines at 15 per cent., and beer at 5 per cent.—we consume 1.024 gallons of alcohol per head, against 2.37 in Great Britain. In another view we do not justify this showing, as Great Britain drinks 40,000,000 gallons of spirits against our 58,000,000; Great Britain's consumption of beer and wine being 3½ times ours. The taxation for our 3,500,000 square miles is £59,750,000, or 25s. 6d. per head, for support of the general Government; Great Britain, to govern 121,000 square miles, £70,000,000, or 43s. a head. Our entire taxation, general, State, and municipal, is 44s. 6d. a head, and Great Britain's is 67s. 10d. a head, which is 52 per cent. greater in proportion to population. The three largest items of expenditure in both countries are given as follows: Great Britain, interest and charges on debt, £25,000,000; army, £15,645,700; navy, £10,586,894. United States, interest and charges on debt, £19,000,000; army, £5,867,145; navy, £2,837,476. Details of comparison between this country and his own Mr. Saunders gives in great abundance. Our roads are much worse, a disadvantage partly overcome by the numerous "tramways." Great Britain is better prepared to repress violence, but on the whole order is better preserved here; life and property are equally secure in both countries. We spend twice as much for public education. Our public offices are arranged more simply, our officials are more prompt, and hence department transactions are easy for laymen; whereas "no civilian would go to a public office unless he was too poor to obtain legal help" in England. The cost of government here is increased, of course, by the large extent of territory; but, even if the army and navy of Great Britain were abolished, there would still be spent, for a more compact population, £40,000,000 more than we expend, as compared with population. The statistics collected as to the cost of railways furnish an excellent argument against the building of railroads by Government. The policy of giving away land is strongly reprehended. The national banks are highly eulogized; our savings-banks are called "very peculiar and dangerous institutions," and it is noted that in England the latter, which are under Government superintendence, are the more secure, while other banks are subject to disastrous failures; and that with us the converse is true. In fine, there are few chapters in the book from which an American may not obtain both instruction and food for reflection.

* Publishers will confer a favor by always marking the price of their books on the wrapper.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Authors.—Titles.	Publishers.—Prices.
Burnett (Mrs. F. H.), <i>Haworth's: a Tale</i>	(Chas. Scribner's Sons) \$1 50
Earl of Vayfield: <i>a Tale</i>	(T. B. Peterson & Bros.) 1 50
Greene (Lieut. F. V.), <i>The Russian Army and its Campaigns in Turkey in 1877-78</i> , 2 vols. (D. Appleton & Co.)	
Hardy (T.), <i>Distracted Young Preacher</i> , swd.....	" " 25
Morgan (H. J.), <i>Dominion Annual Register and Review, 1878</i>	(Dawson Bros.)
Morley (J.), <i>Burke</i>	(Harper & Bros.) 75
Oncken (W.), <i>Allgemeine Geschichte, Part 6, Greece</i> , swd.....	(B. Westermann & Co.)
Reybaud (Mme. C.), <i>Uncle César</i> , swd.....	(D. Appleton & Co.) 25
Stickney (A.), <i>A True Republic</i>	(Harper & Bros.) 1 50
Strahorn (R. E.), <i>To the Rockies and Beyond</i>	(New West Pub. Co.)
Resources of Montana Territory, swd.....	(Helena)
Williamson (J.), <i>Fern Etchings</i>	(J. P. Morton & Co.) 7 50

READY SATURDAY.

History of American Politics.

By ALEXANDER JOHNSTON.

16mo (new Hand-book Series), 75 cents.

Primitive Manners and Customs.

By JAMES A. FARRER. 12mo, \$1 75.

"A book which is really both instructive and amusing, and which will open a new field of thought to many readers."—*London Athenaeum*.

History of the English Language

By T. R. LOUNSBURY, Professor in Yale College.

16mo (new Hand-book Series), \$1.

HENRY HOLT & CO., NEW YORK.

FOR HOME AND OFFICE LIBRARIES.

THE PORTABLE BOOKCASE.

EASTLAKE DESIGN. PRICES REDUCED.

These cases, made of various woods, with leather fringe to match other furniture, are of exceptional value, and give the greatest satisfaction to all who use them. Two sizes, in walnut and pine, always on hand, and special cases of any size or wood promptly supplied. Send for descriptive circular and price-list. Address the sole makers, LOCKWOOD, BROOKS & CO., 381 Washington Street, Boston.

The Boston Foreign Book Store

Removed to the elegant store, 146 Tremont Street, second north of West.

CARL SCHOENHOF.

Foreign Bookseller and Importer.

BOOKS.

New Catalogue, just issued, of Valuable Books. Sent free to any address.

THOMAS BRADBURN,

NEW AND SECOND-HAND BOOKSELLER,
29 Ann Street, New York City.

F. W. CHRISTERN.

Foreign Bookseller and Importer,
180 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK.

The principal publications of Charpentier, Didier, Didot, Hachette, Levy, etc., on hand; also, complete sets of Tauchnitz's collection of British Authors and Teubner's Greek and Roman Classics. Catalogues mailed on demand. European Periodicals received weekly.

THE NATION.—Volumes and Back Numbers for sale. Address the publisher.

"The course of the *Nation* newspaper in its treatment of subjects connected with money, currency, financial legislation, and capital and labor, has always, I believe, been eminently sound and wise; and its files contain the greatest body of serviceable teaching respecting these subjects which can be found in this country. It has also many valuable studies of some of the changes which have been going on during the last fifteen years in our laws, in our methods of political action, and in the character of our people. It is a necessity for clergymen and all students of our national thought and life."—REV. J. B. HARRISON, in the *Christian Register* of August 17, 1878, in an article on the American Literature of Capital and Labor and the Organization of Society on the Principles of Justice.

